

Volume XXII

JULY

Number 3

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Fourteen Years of the Jeanes Fund

JAMES H. DILLARD

Charlottesville, Va.

"Others have given to the large schools; if I could, I should like to help the little country schools." These were the words of Miss Anna T. Jeanes, a Quakeress of Philadelphia, when talking to a visitor in regard to making a contribution toward the education of the colored children in the South. Not long after this conversation she gave a million dollars, the income of which was to be spent in "helping the small rural schools." The work founded on this donation has been going on for fourteen years, and has influenced to a considerable extent rural education throughout the South. "The Jeanes teacher in my county," wrote a superintendent from Alabama, "has revolutionized the sentiment for negro education and incidentally changed the aspect of race relations." Testimony similar to this, though perhaps not quite so strong, has come from many parts of the South, proving the statesmanship of Miss Jeanes's thought and the value of her gift.

From time to time numerous inquiries have come in regard to the life of Miss Jeanes. It has been difficult to get much information. For what we know we are mainly indebted to Miss Emma Walter of Philadelphia, a distant relative. Miss Jeanes was born in Philadelphia on April 7, 1822, the youngest of ten children, all of whom passed away before her death on September 24, 1907. "There is so little to say," writes Miss Walter. "When Anna was four years old her mother died, and upon her sister Mary devolved her care and education. It was no

easy task as she was a child of strong will. All through her long life she thought for herself, and her opinion once formed could not be shaken by any one. She had a keen sense of humor and a very merry, musical laugh. She was a great reader, particularly of books on India, China, Egypt, Japan, and on the history of the religions of the world. She read French with ease and had some talent as a painter.

"About 1900, when she had now inherited all the accumulated fortune of her family, she decided to build and endow a Boarding Home for aged and infirm Friends belonging to the Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting. The building was erected according to her ideas, and here in 1904 she took up her residence. From this time her health and strength gradually failed. Her life had always been exceedingly retired and uneventful, with few acquaintances and no intimate friends outside her immediate family. She had been for many years an annual contributor to all the non-sectarian charities of Philadelphia. In her later years she gave large sums to most of these charities as well as to the Yearly Meeting of Friends of Philadelphia, of which she and all her family were members. She was a life member of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, the Philadelphia Zoological Society, and the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts. She published two books."

The books here referred to are, *The Sacrificer and the Non-Sacrificer*, published by Porter and Coates, 1886; and *Fancy's Flight*, a collection of original verses, printed by Howard W. Jenkins, 921 Arch Street, Philadelphia. The first of these shows an immense amount of reading in oriental literature. The poems show deep religious thought and a genuine gift of poetic expression. They were not printed with her name. The volume now in possession of the Jeanes Board was her private copy, with her name and two additional poems on the fly leaves, written in her own handwriting.

The Friends Boarding Home, which Miss Jeanes built in Germantown, was, as has been said, her place of residence in her last years. It was there that she conferred with Dr. Frissell, Dr. Washington, Mr. Peabody, and others, in regard to making donations in aid of negro education in the South. It was there, after her donation of the million dollars for helping

rural schools, that a committee consisting of Mr. Taft, Mr. Peabody and myself visited her in regard to a matter connected with the investment of the funds. Mr. Taft presented the matter in his kindest manner. Miss Jeanes was a very small woman and appeared to weigh not more than eighty or ninety pounds. Her right hand, badly swollen, rested on the flat arm of her chair. She talked in the brightest and most cheerful way, but politely declined to make changes in the original terms of the gift or to do more than refer us to her business adviser. This was a few months before her death.

On a later visit to the Home, after the death of Miss Jeanes, I heard that her last years were very happy. She lived in a plain room, like the rooms of the other inmates of the Home, and would not permit any special attention to herself in the way of food or comforts. All her acquaintances in the Home and in Philadelphia with whom I had the opportunity of speaking mentioned her strong dislike for any notoriety in regard to her many acts of benevolence.

The legal title of the Fund, established by the gift of a million dollars from Miss Jeanes, is the Negro Rural School Fund, Anna T. Jeanes Foundation. It is generally known simply as the Jeanes Fund. The deed of trust is dated April 22, 1907. The certificate of incorporation is dated November 20, 1907. There had been several more or less informal meetings of the proposed Board, but the first regular meeting of the full Board was held on February 29, 1908. The Board consisted of seventeen members, as follows: David C. Barrow, Andrew Carnegie, James H. Dillard, Hollis Burke Frissell, Abraham Grant, Belton Gilreath, George McAneny, Samuel C. Mitchell, Robert R. Moton, James C. Napier, Robert C. Ogden, Walter H. Page, George Foster Peabody, Robert L. Smith, William H. Taft, Booker T. Washington, Talcott Williams. The officers elected were: James H. Dillard, President and Director; Walter H. Page, Vice-President; Robert R. Moton, Secretary; George Foster Peabody, Treasurer; and Booker T. Washington, Chairman of the Executive Committee.

On the death of Bishop Grant, H. T. Kealing was elected a member of the Board in 1911. On the death of Mr. Ogden, John T. Emlen was elected in 1914. On the death of Dr.

Washington, Emmett J. Scott was elected in 1916. On the death of Dr. Frissell and the resignation of Mr. Gilreath, Theodore D. Bratton and William P. Few were elected in 1918. On the death of Dr. Kealing and of Ambassador Page, George W. Clinton and James E. Gregg were elected in 1919. On the death of Mr. Carnegie and the resignation of Mr. McAneny, Charles E. Mason and C. Everett Bacon were elected in 1920. Since the death of Bishop Clinton no one has been elected to fill the vacancy.

The time between the organization of the Board in February 1908 and the following Fall was spent in looking over the field, making special investigations here and there, and considering how best the income of the Fund could be used. Many letters were received making suggestions and asking for help. In some places there were exaggerated notions of the size of the Fund. A common thought was that a million dollars would be at once distributed. Some of the letters received were amusing. One remote teacher wrote to ask whether his school was going to have any "fun" that year. Another individual wanting personal assistance began his letter by saying, "I am a genius." But most of the letters were sympathetically helpful and wisely suggestive.

A few letters were received from county superintendents asking for aid in various directions for their colored schools. One fact was clear,—that, since the money was to aid small rural schools and these schools were mostly public schools, the work must proceed in coöperation with the regular public school authorities. These letters, therefore, from county superintendents were especially welcomed. But how best could the limited income of the Fund be made to count for the greatest good to the greatest number over so large an area? It was a problem.

After much consideration the decision was that we apply to country schools a plan already in use in certain cities, namely, to employ a teacher, trained in handicraft, to serve several schools. The idea of putting the schools more in touch with the immediate conditions of the life in the community around them was then just becoming a much-discussed problem. Cities had employed teachers of sewing and woodwork to go from school to school on certain days, and it was thought that such a

plan might be worked in the rural districts. The first teacher employed by a county superintendent to do such work and to be paid by the Jeanes Fund was in Iberville Parish, Louisiana, where Mr. L. E. Messick was superintendent. The teacher was Mrs. M. L. Sorrell. Her salary was \$42.50 a month for eight months. She was to have headquarters in the school at Plaquemine, the parish seat, where she was to work two days in the week, devoting the other three days to five schools within fairly easy reach. Fifty or more such extension teachers were gradually placed and began their work during the new session of 1908-9. It is interesting to note that Superintendent Messick is still in office and that Mrs. Sorrell still holds her position. Her salary is now \$80 a month for ten months, of which the parish board pays \$45 a month.

Among the early letters received from county superintendents was one from Mr. Jackson Davis, then superintendent of Henrico County, Virginia, who had come in touch with Hampton, and had heard of the beginnings of industrial work in colored schools in certain parts of Virginia. He wanted an industrial teacher to cover his whole county. This proposition was gladly received and the whole-county plan was urged wherever arrangements could be satisfactorily made. After some consultation Mr. Davis employed Miss Virginia E. Randolph, who also still holds the position. The choice proved a most excellent one. At the end of the session she printed a brief report, telling, for each of the schools visited, the amount of industrial work and general improvements accomplished. This simple report told the story so well in concrete terms that we printed a thousand copies and mailed them to county superintendents throughout the South.

From counties where the industrial teacher, or extension teacher as she was then called, confined her work to four or five schools, had come letters asking why she could not go to others. Furthermore it was found that the tendency was for the industrial teacher to give too much of her time to the one school at which she had her headquarters. Manifestly the Henrico plan was much to be preferred where it could be put into practice. This was not easy at first. There were difficulties of transportation; but gradually, during the first two

years, the extension teachers all became supervising industrial teachers for the whole county, or for as many schools in the county as the superintendent might designate. It was in the way of aiding in transportation that the county boards, at the suggestion of the superintendent, began to give their first financial support to the work.

Thanks to the fortunate selection of the teachers and to their good service and fine spirit, the work prospered. No cut-and-dried rules were laid down. The supervising teacher was to introduce and supervise simple forms of industrial work, but beyond this she was free to follow out any line of neighborhood improvement which might open up, or for which she might feel some special fitness. The point was to get a good teacher and let her do the rest. Some excelled in home visiting, some in raising money, some in forming clubs, some in health work, some in promoting gardens. It was always something good and something to be done. There are in fact no words too strong to express the admiration which any one who has known these Jeanes teachers must feel for the ability and devotion which from the first they have shown in their work. There have been no nobler pioneers and missionaries than these humble teachers. They have literally gone about doing good. Their occasional conferences, by states or group of states, have been unique among educational meetings. Their simple, straightforward reports of their work in the background have been a revelation and an inspiration to all school officials and other visitors who have from time to time attended these gatherings.

Thus did the work of these traveling supervising teachers, who came to be known simply as Jeanes Teachers, seem to open up as the appointed mission of the Jeanes Fund. Occasional calls in other directions were at times so pressing and so evidently fitting that here and there a little assistance was given. Here a term was extended, here a building was repaired, here some aid was given for a new building, here a donation was made to enable the employment of a special industrial teacher in a larger rural school, here some help was given for promoting a summer school for teachers. But these were side issues. The revenues of the Fund were too small to accomplish any appreci-

able results, in so large a field, along any of these much-needed directions. It would be like throwing pebbles into quick-sand.

In a report made to the Jeanes Board ten years ago emphasis was laid on the great need of some movement for better school-houses in the rural districts. It was pointed out how impossible it was to teach neatness, orderliness, and thrift in some shack where every look of the child rested upon evidences to the contrary. Many appeals came for aid in building school-houses, some from county superintendents, some from the Jeanes Teachers with the approval of their county superintendents, all offering financial coöperation. Little did we then know that the great need was soon to be supplied by the splendid donations of Mr. Julius Rosenwald. It is a satisfaction to state in this connection that, according to the agent of the Rosenwald Fund, Mr. S. L. Smith, a large proportion of the projects for building the Rosenwald rural school-houses are due to the efforts of the Jeanes Teachers.

When the work of the supervising teachers began to be known, the demand soon exceeded the means of supply. In spite of the beginning of appropriations from public funds, there was call for additional outside aid. This came, and we make grateful acknowledgment. Without such aid the work would have been severely hampered. In 1911-12 the newly established Phelps-Stokes Fund gave \$2,500 to aid in paying salaries; in 1912-13 the same Fund gave \$2,500 for salaries, and \$1,000 for aid in building and equipment; in 1913-14 \$2,500 for salaries, and \$1,500 for building and equipment. In 1914 the General Education Board began its donations in promoting the extension of the work of the supervising teachers. In 1914-15 this Board gave \$5,000; in 1915-16, \$11,000; in 1916-17, \$11,400; in 1917-18, \$16,000; in 1918-19, \$20,000. At this time the work of the Home Makers clubs, which had been supported by the General Educational Board, was taken over by the agents of the Federal appropriations, and the Board turned its contributions for rural work in the direction of larger support for the Jeanes Teachers. Thus in 1919-20 we received altogether from the General Education Board \$60,988; in 1920-21, \$75,011; and in 1921-22, \$80,000.

Most of the aid given for the extension of terms has come from the outside. We have spent in this way only the small amount of \$14,044, of which \$9,303 came through donations from Mr. Rosenwald. The plan was to give the amount needed for one month, on condition that the community also add a month. Although aid in extending the term of a single school here and there is of little account in influencing the general condition, it was thought that where as many as six schools in a county would make the extension the general result would be good, and it has proved to be so. The point was to do enough in a county to create an atmosphere. When a county superintendent in Tennessee reported the offer to his school board, a member asked, "You say this offer comes from the outside? I move that we ourselves extend the term of every colored school in the county one month," and the resolution was passed. There has been much improvement in the extension of terms in rural schools, but there is still room for stimulation from the outside.

The most gratifying fact in the work of the Jeanes Fund has been the welcome and the gradual increase of support received from the local school officials, on whom success has always depended. From the first we have helped only at the request of the county superintendent and under his direction. What success the work of the Fund has attained is largely due to the interest of the state and county superintendents and in later years to the wise and energetic direction of the State Agents for colored schools connected with the various State Departments of Education. During the past ten years there has been a steady increase of financial support from public school funds. In 1912-13 the county funds contributed to the work a total amount of only \$3,402; in 1921-22 the amount was \$114,521. At present, in 1923, there are 266 Jeanes Teachers, and some counties have similar work unconnected with the Jeanes Fund.

It may be doubted whether anywhere in the world a more complete illustration of coöperation can be found than in the present work of education for the colored children of the South. And it is coöperation without conflict, and except in rare instances without wasteful duplication. It is little short of wonderful how the various agencies dovetail and support each other.

The General Education Board, the Rosenwald Fund, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the Slater Fund (especially through the County Training Schools, which are also aided by the General Education Board, the Carnegie Corporation, and Mr. Rosenwald), the Jeanes Fund and the various Church and Missionary Boards are all not only doing their work, but doing it in the spirit of coöperation with one another, and with the state departments of education.

The Value of Medical Research to Mankind and to Animals

ESPECIALLY AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF
LOUIS PASTEUR*

W. W. KEEN, M.D.

Emeritus Professor of Surgery, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.

It is a great pleasure to visit a new and vigorous institution of learning for the first time. It is still more refreshing when an American finds the same ideals, the same hopes, and the same inspirations as in his own local environment. It is thrice stimulating when one goes from one of the original thirteen colonies to another—a happy, not an ominous number—to find that we are linked arm in arm in fighting ignorance and irreligion. You of Carolina and we of Pennsylvania march forward together, as did our heroic forbears a century and a half ago, under the same banner of Christian hope and assured ultimate victory.

The endowment under whose auspices I speak is intended for service to the citizens of this community, to broaden and enlarge their views of world movements in Religion, in Science, and in the duties of Citizenship. Thank God, this refers to the citizenship of a reunited country, reunited by the fellowship of a common service against the cruelties of one of the oldest and proudest of the ancient monarchies of Europe, and again against the arrogance and lust of power of the newest and most powerful enemy of liberty the world has ever seen. Our sons and brothers lie side by side "in Flanders Fields," dyed red by Southern and Northern blood, in defence of Civilization itself.

I propose, in this course of lectures, to set before you, as fellow citizens with me of our dearly loved country, some of

* The first of a course of three lectures on the John McTyeire Flowers Foundation, given at Trinity College in May, 1923. The basis of this course is the author's Colver Lectures at Brown University, which were published for the University by Houghton Mifflin Company and copyrighted in 1917. Special permission was kindly given for their use at Trinity College. Many changes and additions have been made in order to bring the subject up to date.

the great advances made during only my own lifetime, as a stimulant to our certain expectation of larger and better advances to come.

I shall exhort you, as members of an enlightened community, to encourage and foster research in every field of human endeavor.

Who, thirty years ago, would have thought it possible for us to see our own bones regardless of flesh and clothing, yet Roentgen, the discoverer of the X-ray in 1895, has just died. We can now speak to the Antipodes and hear the reply with our mortal ears. You and I should be full of faith that, in this century or the next, by the mind of some genius, mayhap yet to be born, the human race will obtain the power to wield and control the as yet only half-dreamed-of vast powers which God has enfolded and imprisoned in nature for our use. The gigantic powers of the molecule, the atom and the electron will surely be within our control before long. We shall then hold in our hands the thunderbolts of God.

It is self evident that we can only learn how best to utilize our present possible resources by Research of all kinds. My congenial task is to consider what has already been done during my own lifetime towards the promotion of Human Welfare by Medical Research. The duty of the community to promote Medical Research will follow as a self-evident proposition.

HUMAN WELFARE

What are the factors that promote Human Welfare?

First, and by far the most important, is Good Health.

Without that, one is crippled. Having it, one can achieve the rest, such as food, clothing, shelter, the other prime needs of the body; and for the mind, education, mental development, travel, books, pictures, and all the varied factors which collectively we call "Civilization." To them are to be added as far as possible the negative assets of life, such as freedom from sorrow and grief caused by death, especially the premature death of those dear to us.

To aid us in achieving those blessings, and free us from those sorrows, Medical Research is our best friend. The human mind—especially the medical mind—is never content

with things as they are. We are ever seeking to decrease our ignorance and increase our knowledge; to make things better, to devise new means for health and happiness.

When the first man asked, "Why am I sick?" "By what means can I get well?" "How can I prevent future illness?" Medical Research was born. For twenty-five centuries these questions as to health have been constantly and insistently asked and the medical profession has been trying to answer them.

For many centuries we had only clinical observation; that is, pain and the physical surface phenomena of the body of the patient—fever, eruption, swelling, wounds, fractures, and other accidents. Then in the sixteenth century, the experimental method began slowly to arise.

By the *first* method we had to observe for years and in many patients, Nature's vagaries in different diseases and her different phenomena even in the same disease, after her haphazard method.

By the *second* method, in a short time the same observer, having the now known causes of human and animals' diseases at his beck and call, induces in animals certain diseases under conditions chosen at will, varies these conditions one at a time, notes the differing results of each change, not only by his five senses, formerly his only allies, but by many instruments of precision wholly unknown fifty years ago, and many of which cannot possibly be used on man. He can also verify his inferences by observing external phenomena, by post-mortem examinations in animals of every internal organ at varying self-chosen periods in the progress of the disease, and so learn the "natural history" of the disease, the phenomena of its various stages, and the relative values of various remedies or operations.

This method is not only valuable in acute and fatal diseases, but may be even more so in protracted diseases when death reveals to us only the end results, and not the early changes and later stages of the principal malady; while in non-fatal diseases, death gives us chiefly the results of the intercurrent fatal malady which obscure those of the original disease.

It is too often overlooked that for century after century Nature has been pitilessly performing *her* crude and cruel experiments and killing millions of human beings every year. She has inflicted untold suffering without any merciful anesthetic and with only occasional inadequate and passing relief by our narcotics. In place of these millions of human beings, an infinitesimally smaller number of animals have suffered far less and far less acutely in research and have yielded extraordinary and most beneficent results, as I shall show.

In such experiments, not only are anesthetics desirable from humane motives (and the whole world gladly credits my profession with abundant charity and humanity), but it is self-evident that delicate, modern, technical operations require the absolutely complete relaxation of anesthesia, to say nothing of the possible injuries to the operators themselves from struggling animals. Besides this, as I shall show, the knowledge derived from such researches, undertaken primarily for the benefit of man, has been and will be shared by countless animals year after year.

Moreover, these researches have gradually enlarged our horizon so that now we recognize the "solidarity" of *all* living things from plants to man.

That mysterious something, that wonderful reality which we call "Life," attains its highest and most complex development in the intellectual leaders of human thought and action. Life also reaches down to the lowest monad and the lowest plants which simply exist and reproduce their kind.

As we go down the series, the processes by which life is maintained become more and more simple; organs which perform precisely similar function in man, animal, or fish, such as the liver and the stomach, the heart and the lungs, are modified and at last may even disappear. Yet "Life," in its simplest activities of growth and reproduction, still is there.

The lower and simpler forms of life possess fewer and fewer weapons for either defense or escape, but preserve their species by the enormous numbers of the offspring to counterbalance wholesale destruction by their natural enemies. They also have the faculty of enormously rapid growth, not only in number, but in weight.

Fish provide huge numbers of eggs, as in our familiar shad roe, and the lowest forms of life multiply with an almost incredible rapidity.

The cholera bacillus divides into two, then four, eight, sixteen, and so on every twenty minutes, so that in seven hours, if given room enough and food enough, one bacillus would have produced over one hundred and thirty-four millions of descendants. Each of these descendants possesses the same fecundity as its parent. What the number would be in a week or a month staggers one's wildest imagination. "One codfish would soon fill up the vastness of the sea, and one fly could soon shut out the sun."

The rate of growth of the silkworm in weight is equally astonishing. In the first thirty days after being hatched from the egg, it increases in weight fifteen thousand times, or five hundred times its original weight every day. We can get a more impressive idea of what this means by comparing it with a human baby. Were the same rule to hold, a baby weighing seven pounds at birth would weigh thirty-five hundred pounds the very next day, and when a month old would weigh one hundred and five thousand pounds, or over fifty "short tons," which, however, could hardly be called "short weight." If you will pardon the abominable but expressive argot of the street, that would be "some baby." But we may be consoled by remembering that both mother and nurse would be of corresponding elephantine bulk—"made to fit the job," as the exponents of efficiency would say.

But this is a gross, unimaginative way of looking at such a phenomenon. When we analyze it seriously, what a wonder-world we enter upon. How these little worms must feed, feed, feed! Think of the abounding life of each microscopic cell. Every one has to multiply itself five hundred times in every twenty-four hours. Yet all goes on in an orderly manner according to the law of its being, but with incredible swiftness, day after day. The only wonder is that in such speed there should not be errors and mistakes by the thousand. Yet Mother Nature breeds true to her well-chosen model. And

what superb work such a lowly, little worm does, for, presto! and the yellow cocoon becomes the resplendent silk and the glossy satin.

Animals closely resemble man, not only in their structure and functions, but also in their maladies. Their diseases are often identical with human diseases and are caused by the same bacteria; e.g., tuberculosis, tetanus, anthrax, etc. What is true of the animal world applies with modification even in the vegetable world. Plants carry on a modified respiration and circulation, they assimilate food, their wounds are healed, their diseases, even cancer itself, are analogous to the diseases of man and animals; they are susceptible to the same poisons; they live, they grow, they reproduce their kind, and they die. These are all manifestations of that still, mysterious force which we call "Life." The physiology of animals and plants and the pathology of their diseases throw light on the problems of human psychology, pathology, health, life and death.¹ The man who, like Theobald Smith, devotes himself to the study of disease in many lower animals, has even a richer field to cultivate and may even have a broader vision than the man who limits himself to the diseases of man alone.

The latter half of the nineteenth century has been the period of the most marvelous activity in research in every branch of science, astronomy, physics, chemistry, etc., and not less in medicine and surgery. This progress has been made possible by the extensive use of the experimental method more than by any other means. Through all of this period I have lived and I have been able to avail myself of its beneficent discoveries for the welfare of mankind. I speak, therefore, of the things that I know and can vouch for personally, so far, at least, as surgery is concerned, and I have reliable evidence of the truth in other departments of medicine.

I took part in the old horribly fatal surgery of the Civil War and have borne a part in the struggle with infection and death until, thanks to Pasteur and Lister, we have emerged from a septic Purgatory into an aseptic Paradise. Only those

¹ See the remarkable book just published by the Longmans *The Physiology of the Ascent of Sap*, by Sir J. C. Boac, H.R.S., of Calcutta, a most fascinating study.

who have lived through the transition period can fully appreciate the joy of deliverance from Death, who formerly claimed, as his right, from five or ten, to over ninety of our patients in every one hundred.

Much of this work has been done in quiet, thoughtful, thorough, ingenious researches in laboratories. After repeated careful tests upon animals, the results have been applied to the amelioration of human and animal diseases and the saving of human and animal life, as we shall see further on.

It is a spectacular feat to rush into a burning building and at the peril of limb and life to emerge, singed and bleeding, with a precious child in one's arms, rescued from a frightful death. It is lauded by the entire community and rightly so. But to work quietly in the laboratory, surrounded by deadly germs, and to discover the antotoxin of diphtheria, a remedy which is rescuing not one child, but thousands upon thousands of children year after year,—is not this a feat deserving a greater reward than that accorded to physical bravery? Too often such a modest laborer in the Master's vineyard is forgotten or never known. But even then he has his reward, hidden it may be in his own bosom and known and recognized by his Maker—a greater joy than gold or jewels can yield.

In my early professional life, before such researches had been carried on, and the cause or the means of their prevention had been discovered, one single case of yellow fever, cholera, or plague in New York harbor created terror in the whole city or even the whole nation, paralyzed commerce, and caused a wholesale exodus and widespread, most annoying quarantine. Now such a case scarcely wins a headline on the first page of the morning papers, so complete and so justified is the confidence of the community in the ability of scientific medicine to cope with and to conquer the disease. Quarantine is no longer what its name declares—a detention of forty days. In fact it rarely is necessary, and when necessary is short and shorn of the horrors of a century ago. Even smallpox no longer sends everybody to the railroad, the steamship, and the auto, but sends them straight to the doctor, who quickly gives them the protection of a simple vaccination.

I bring you, therefore, a message of joy and good cheer, of wonderful achievement in every department of medicine and wonderful contributions to Human Welfare.

ANESTHESIA

It is almost superfluous for me to call your attention to one of the greatest boons ever conferred on suffering humanity—the abolition of the horrible pain attending surgical operations. This has done far more than merely abolish such pains. It has made possible prolonged and delicately difficult operations which require the absolute immobility of the patient. Imagine an abdominal section, such as is now common, with removal of a portion of the intestine followed by uniting the two open ends so carefully and securely that no fatal leakage of a single drop shall occur. Such an operation, by reason of extensive adhesions or from other causes, may easily require an hour or even more. Could flesh and blood lie quietly, still as a statue, while such an operation was being done?

But besides the drugs for general anesthesia, Medical Research within the last thirty years has discovered means by which local anesthesia can be attained; that is to say, the part to be operated on is made entirely insensible to pain while the patient himself remains entirely conscious. Nearly everybody has an innate aversion to loss of consciousness *per se*. This is wholly apart from fear. Various methods, by means of freezing, or the subcutaneous injection of certain drugs, such as cocaine, novocain, eucain, etc., are employed. Besides their subcutaneous use these same drugs can be injected into the sheath of the spinal cord by lumbar puncture, thus making all the body below the waist insensible to pain. It is not within the scope of these lectures to assess the relative values and the dangers of these various methods, but only to point out how the marvelous resources of science have been mobilized for the welfare and comfort of mankind and of animals. Happy, indeed, are not only the surgeons, but also those engaged in experimental research, that investigations, such as Claude Bernard, Magendie and others were obliged to carry on when anes-

thetics were unknown, and far more difficult and delicate operations than they ever dreamed of, can now be done, and are done, on animals painlessly.

The first public use of ether was at the Massachusetts General Hospital on October 16, 1846. Chloroform was first used on November 17, 1847. About 1867 nitrous oxid came into common use in dentistry, and during the last ten to fifteen years has been largely used in surgery.

When I have heard my old master in surgery, the elder Gross, and other surgeons of his generation, tell of the way in which patients were bound hand and foot and held in the tight grip of four strong orderlies to secure a partial quietude, and of the almost frantic involuntary struggles of patients, and their screams of agony, in the pre-anesthetic days, I have thanked God that I was born too late to participate in such horrors. Then he was the best surgeon who could amputate a limb in five or ten seconds less than any other surgeon. The painstaking, accurate, artistic surgery, such as today is achieved by every good surgeon, was absolutely unthinkable even to the most dexterous surgeons in the first half of the nineteenth century. It had to be what, without casting reproach on our predecessors, one may call "slap-dash surgery" or none—"slap-dash surgery" might easily be inaccurate surgery and do great harm.

INSTRUMENTS OF PRECISION

Among the most important means by which Medical Research is promoted are instruments of precision. When I studied medicine, a few, in fact a very few, doctors possessed a microscope. Strange to say, the medical colleges had none. Only those private students who were so fortunate as to have the most enlightened preceptors ever saw a microscope, much less had the chance to use one. I doubt if there were half a dozen thermometers and hypodermic syringes in the whole Army of the Potomac in the Civil War. A number of years passed before self-registering thermometers were made. The first short clinical thermometer I ever saw was brought to me from London by Weir Mitchell in 1876. The first book on medical thermometry was published by Wunderlich in 1868,

three years after the Civil War had closed. Imagine the plight of the mother of a family today without a thermometer!

Now, for experimental researches, there are electric thermometers by which one can make continuous observations in a hospital and record them at stations a mile away from the patient and the instrument.

How and why does the blood leave other parts of the body and go to the head when you think? In man and animals, in close proximity to the jugular vein in the neck, is the sympathetic nerve—a slender, nervous cord, the use of which nobody knew. A few years before the Civil War, Brown-Séquard cut this nerve, “just to see what would happen.” He found that the pupil of the eye on the same side contracted to a pin-point, the blood-vessels of the ear of a cat or a rabbit dilated and the ear became much redder and hotter. This simple experiment opened the door to a vast store of knowledge. The sympathetic nerve is the means by which automatic changes in the distribution of the blood are effected all over the body: changes which we cannot initiate and cannot arrest—changes which are essential to well being. This nerve controls the size of the pupil so that, on going out into bright sunlight, in a few moments it protects the eye from injury by contracting the pupil. On going into a darkened room, the pupil gradually dilates so that enough light enters the eye for you to see.

This little nerve spreads out over every blood vessel all over the body, enlarges its diameter if blood is needed in any organ, and lessens its caliber when the need has passed. When you eat a meal the stomach becomes redder than the most inflamed eye you ever saw. All its blood vessels are dilated to their maximum to enable the glands of the stomach to secrete enough gastric juice for digestion. When this is accomplished, the blood vessels gradually narrow and soon are scarcely visible. When you blush for shame or grow pale with fear, this slender, nervous cord has produced a dilation or a contraction of the blood vessels of your face and neck, according to your emotion.

When you are wounded the same obedient nerve automatically dilates the blood vessels which carry the extra blood needed for repair. The area around the wound is reddened

and is hotter than the unwounded part. What a wonderfully beneficent mechanism this is—how useful—how indispensable!

And we knew nothing of all this astonishing action, so important in health and disease, in physiology, pathology, surgery, every department of medicine, until Brown-Séquard cut this little cord in the neck, to see what would happen!

If I only had the time I could tell you other equally interesting, in fact fascinating, stories of many discoveries in the physiology of digestion, of respiration, in the physiological chemistry of the blood and of the normal secretions, and in pathology or the changes brought about by disease. Our knowledge of all these subjects, instead of being the shrewd but uncertain guesses of close observers, has become exact and positive knowledge upon which we found not only our diagnosis, but our treatment. It is quite safe to say that in practically all disease, save perhaps cancer, the death-rate is steadily and often rapidly lessening as a result of such scientific research. And we doctors who live by sickness and accident are the foremost in these researches and rejoice with joy unspeakable at every advance in the conquest of Disease and Death!

Many of you are now familiar with the blood-pressure apparatus which in the last few years has won its place in diagnosis. Whole books are devoted to this one subject. In animals we can ascertain this pressure far more accurately than in man, for we connect the apparatus directly with the blood current in an artery or a vein. The pulse-beats and its curves are minutely analyzed by complicated instruments and recorded on smoked paper on a slowly revolving drum.

When, by reason of shock and loss of blood, the blood pressure during an operation falls dangerously low, we now make a transfusion of blood. In certain diseases, as you all know from the daily papers, transfusion is also frequently resorted to. What you do not know is the long series of experimental researches on animals made by many surgeons, which has converted what was so dangerous an operation that it had been abandoned, into a safe one. Now, thanks especially to the researches of that genius, Carrel, transfusion has become so safe that it is used even in cases of newborn babies who may

be bleeding to death, and are changed as by a miracle from dying babies into thriving and healthy babies.

The color of the blood is sometimes a very important element in deciding for or against an operation, or for or against giving an anesthetic. It can easily be determined by an instrument to measure the color of the blood. The freezing point of the blood, the time necessary for it to clot, its bacteriology, and its chemistry all require constant research and are all constantly increasingly valuable.

But the instrumental study of the heart has progressed further than even the most vivid imagination could portray. By the X-rays we can see its size and witness its beating—a marvelous automatic act, the continuance of which dominates our existence from even before birth down to the last moments of life. Very recent improvements in the instruments now enable us to obtain X-ray pictures showing the action of each auricle and each ventricle separately.

All muscular action—note this fact—all muscular action generates slight currents of electricity. Therefore, the muscular contraction of the walls of these four cavities of the heart generate slight currents of electricity. Such a current, slight as it is, is sufficient to actuate another marvelously delicate instrument, the electro-cardiograph. By this we can record on a revolving drum the phases of movement of all these four cavities.

The anatomists have discovered, at a point where the superior vena cava empties all the blood of the head, neck and arms into the right auricle, a special network of muscles and nerves which Thomas Lewis, of London, has called the "pacemaker" of the heart, for the contractions of the heart are started by it. His, the German anatomist, some years ago discovered a similar small bundle of muscular and nervous fibers in the furrow between the auricles and ventricles which regulates the contractions of the ventricles. The auricles and ventricles do not contract all four at once, as we would suppose, but in a rhythmical succession. The "pacemaker" starts and the "bundle of His" regulates the successive rhythmical contractions of these four cavities. If the passage of stimuli, starting from these two points or foci, is interfered with, a certain number of

impulses may be blocked and, for example, only one in two may get through. If the impulses are entirely blocked, the auricles and ventricles beat wildly and entirely independently of each other. These interferences are, therefore, called respectively "partial" and "complete heart block." By the electro-cardiograph, we can study minutely every phase of such movements down to what occurs in the fiftieth part of a second. A diagnosis which it is absolutely impossible to make by touch and ear is positively and accurately observed by such a wonderful instrument of precision. It gives the very earliest warning of danger, long before our clumsy natural senses can find out that anything is wrong.

By the X-ray, as you know, we can now discover foreign bodies in the windpipe and lungs, in the esophagus, stomach and intestines, stones in the gall bladder, kidneys, ureter and urinary bladder; can see an artery whose walls have become hardened by arterio-sclerosis, can see foreign bodies and tumors in the brain, and can see even the convolutions of the brain, fractures, dislocations, tumors, abscesses in bones, unsuspected abscesses at the roots of the teeth, tuberculous cavities in the lungs, cancer of the stomach, etc. By mixing bismuth with food (bismuth is impervious to X-rays and so casts a shadow) we can follow the food from the stomach through the intestines and locate cancer of the bowel. By this method, Cannon, of Harvard, has shown the physical effect of fear and other emotions in arresting the digestive processes.

In 1891 Quincke, of Kiel, first introduced "lumbar puncture." A long needle attached to a hypodermic syringe is inserted within the sheath of the spinal cord, but below the cord itself, in the small of the back or "lumbar" region, and some of the fluid which bathes the spinal cord and the brain is obtained. The pressure of this cerebro-spinal fluid is important and can be measured, and the presence or absence of any foreign substance, such as blood, pus, certain bacteria, etc., can be determined by the microscope. An unsuspected fracture of the base of the skull may declare itself by such blood. No diagnosis of cerebro-spinal meningitis is accepted at present as scientifically proved except by lumbar puncture. Without this a large percentage of mistakes occur.

All of you are familiar with at least a few of the ingenious "scopes" by which we can look into various cavities of the body. Helmholtz, of Berlin, that wonderful genius, first showed the way by devising the "ophthalmoscop" in 1851. In 1858 Czermak, of Prague, devised the "laryngoscope." This was so new when I entered the Jefferson Medical College in 1860 that to my almost incredulous inquiry "whether it was really possible, as Green, of St. Louis, asserted, actually to see the vocal chords in a living patient," my preceptor, later the distinguished Professor J. M. DaCosta, replied rather hesitatingly that he "thought" it was!

Now we look not only into the interior of the eye and the larynx, but down into the bronchi, into the esophagus, and even inspect the inside of the stomach, the bladder, and every other hollow organ accessible from the exterior.

To explain how great has been the advance in knowledge of function, and in diagnosis and treatment, by reason of the positive information obtained by these various instruments of precision, and how much our patients have benefited by this new knowledge would take me too far afield, but in a general way I may say that to them is due practically, I should say seventy-five per cent of our present knowledge of the diseases of the organs susceptible to this method of examination. Without these ingenious instruments physiologists, physicians, and the surgeons and specialists would be as utterly helpless, as if, in our community life, our railroads and steamships, our telegraphs and telephones were suddenly abolished.

(To be concluded).

Latin-American Opinion of Pan-Americanism

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

Edgefield, S. C.

Aside from the controversies as to the details of its definition and application, Pan-Americanism possesses a minimum basis in fact on which all critical observers agree. There is an American continent bound together by a degree of geographic proximity of the republics which compose it, a sentiment of republicanism and democracy, and the sentiment derived from past assistance to each other in achieving independence against the European nations. There are numerous orators—north and south—backed by popular sentiment, who perennially proclaim the Amphictyonic concord which is alleged to exist among the nations of the New World. Their work is supplemented by an organization which bends its efforts toward creating the belief that coöperation on a basis of equality does exist among the twenty American republics and should be further intensified. The task of this paper is not to subject these pretensions to a moral analysis and thereby evolve another opinion as to the worth of Pan-Americanism. To us is the simpler task of presenting with terse comment the opinions of Hispanic-American publicists as to the nature of Pan-Americanism and its alleged beneficence or malevolence.

The commentators on Pan-Americanism are far more numerous in Latin America than in Anglo-America. In the southern continent orators, demagogues, jurists, editors, sociologists and statesmen vie with each other in discussing a theme which only the metropolitan dailies, senators and foreign secretaries mention in the northern continent. Several causes for this disparity of interest suggest themselves to us. The United States being wealthier, more powerful and more populous than all Latin America, the nature of its relation to the other states of America is less vital to its people than the nature of the relation of the Latin states to it. The Saxon communities have solved the difficulties of internal friction by federal integration, while the Latin communities have signally failed in all attempts at federation. Hence the good citizen of Ohio or Kansas, bound

as he is within the secure bonds of nationalism, can afford to have little concern for international problems, while the citizens of the republics of less population to the south are faced with baffling international problems. Many South American intellectuals seem still to dwell within the light of eighteenth century political speculations and nineteenth century sociological theories, while the intellectuals of North America are more realistic. Hence more numerous speculations as to the nature and future of diplomatic relations are in order in the southern communities.

We shall consider the attitude of Latin America towards Pan-Americanism, first, from the point of view of those who favor it; second, from the point of view of those who regard it as a menace to Latin civilization; then we shall present a brief consideration of Pan-Hispanism, the positive policy which aims at inter-Hispanic solidarity as opposed to inter-American solidarity.

In order to be able to appreciate most forcibly the high esteem in which many Latin American publicists hold a *rap-prochement* between their countries and the United States we have selected utterances made at times of high emotional hope, viz., when Wilson was speaking of the high mission of a neutral America, and, afterwards, for a war of democracy and the rights of small nations; and when the orators of Latin America were guests at the North American banquet table.

The orators, unhampered by reservations, spoke with utmost felicity. Ernesto Quesada, a distinguished Argentine politician and professor, before the Pan-American Scientific Conference of 1916, spoke of the new destiny of America in the face of a bankrupt European diplomacy. "The new international law of America," he said, "must take the place of that of Europe." In the achievement of this lofty aim the United States, as the richest and most powerful nation of the western hemisphere, must lead the smaller countries of America. "We all think . . . that the leadership of civilization of the future will be in the United States."¹ Victor M. Muartua, a delegate from Peru, fondly hoped that the Wilsonian inter-

¹ Ernesto Quesada, *El Nuevo Pan-Americanismo* (Buenos Aires, 1916), 112 et seq.

pretation of Pan-Americanism would be speedily put into operation.² Jesús Semprum, a Venezuelan man of letters, in 1918 pictured the United States as a new force which will save the world. Pershing's men marched to battle moved by an idyllic heroism. "As the deceptive mists fade away," he generously added, "our eyes, filled with the limpid grace of compromise, behold the Uncle of the Big Stick transformed into a heroic paladin."³ "My country," declared Pardo Grave de Peralta, of Honduras, "is ready to form a new alliance, defensive and offensive, with the United States. The doctrine of Pan-Americanism is the grandest doctrine proclaimed in the last century for the defense and continued prosperity of all the American countries. It is a *vinculo* of coöperation."⁴ Ruy Barbosa, the most distinguished of Brazilian demagogues, arose from a sick bed on the news of the Armistice of 1918, to herald the advent of the Utopia which he believed the United States and Great Britain had made possible. The list of distinguished Latin Americans who regard with approval the relation of their country with the United States might be extended far beyond the limits of this essay.

Less emotional and more in touch with the read advantages of inter-American accord are Ernesto J. J. Bott, an Argentine publicist, and Julio E. Rueda, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Quito. Bott argues that it was impossible for the United States in the past to deal without friction with Latin-American republics on account of the disordered condition which has characterized their history. North American imperialism, he thinks, will vanish just as soon as the Latin countries eliminate anarchy and institute progress. The words of Wilson are the authoritative expression of the common ideals, common laws, common systems of public instruction and common efforts for mutual defense which have been regnant throughout the republican history of the two Americas. The future holds for the continent a closer union which will be made possible by a more extensive interchange of goods.⁵ Rueda

² Ernesto Quesada, *Ibid*, 112 et seq.

³ *Inter-America*, II, 263.

⁴ Quesada, *op. cit.* 93.

⁵ Ernesto J. J. Bott, *Una Evolucion Trascendental de la Vida Internacional en America*, (Buenos Aires, 1918), 17, 131, 140, 142.

says that it is not necessary to apologize for the country of Franklin, of Jefferson, of Monroe and Longfellow. The great Pan-American Union guarantees the sovereignty of each American state. The United States has no reason to extend her frontier, for her domains are ample and she does not wish to endanger her liberties by imperialistic adventures. It is not necessary for her to conquer or to colonize Latin America to obtain the benefits of its trade. The "chain of gold" will not bring subjection to the South, but will serve as a bond of union for mutual profit.⁶

Yet it should be remembered that the Latin American promoters of Pan-Americanism seldom speak without the hope that this doctrine will ultimately resolve itself into a league of American nations, made concrete by an inter-American court of justice before which all the American nations will be obliged to go for the adjustment of their international differences. This political organ, believes Alejandro Alvarez, should be given economic reality by the foundation of a *Zollverein*.⁷ All South Americans cherish a proud patriotism which yields before neither good manners nor sociological ideology. Once the *ignis fatuus* of American fraternity shall have vanished we may expect a more realistic attitude toward the United States.

And we must remember that good intentions and fine words are the cheapest of international commodities. Were some arresting cause for international mis-understanding to arise between the United States and the more powerful Latin American countries, the shrewd observer could only expect action in the place of fine words. As imposing a symposium of kind words as passed between German and American leaders in the decade before 1914, may be constructed of Latin American interchanges. However, vague international flatteries, however much they may please the present generation, can hardly be expected to withstand a clash of trade interests or national egotisms.

The fond hope that the United States ever intends to give more than lip service to the principles of American international brotherhood is dispelled by one of South America's incisive

⁶ Julio E. Rueda, *Inter-America*, II, 145-153.

⁷ Alejandro Alvarez, *El Derecho Internacional de Porvenir* (Madrid, 1916); *Ibid*, *Le Droit International Americain* (Paris, 1910); Gregorio Uriarte, *Problemas de Política Internacional Americana*, (Buenos Aires, 1915).

writers, Señor Calderón, of Peru. He truly says that the North American holds in contempt the *mestizo* democracy to the south, and that the North American people are superbly ignorant of Latin culture and temperament.⁸ To expect the country which is more powerful than all the twenty other republics of the continent to submit—in the spirit of Pan-Americanism, as defined by its friends north and south—points of differences it may have with one of these twenty republics, seems to us to carry to an absurd extreme the hope which some may cherish in the efficacy of international law. Costa Rica or Nicaragua, Wilson and Álvarez to the contrary notwithstanding, can hardly hope in the stern arbitrament of international relationship to stand in a court of justice on a parity with the United States.

The indictment of Pan-Americanism by Latin-American writers is based on the tendency of the United States to advance its territories to the south. Almost every book or article discusses the subject with a reference to some phase of Yankee expansion into the territories which once belonged to the king of Spain or to the Spanish republics,—colonization in Florida and Texas, military occupation of Haiti and parts of Central America, financial and commercial exploitation further south. The term *Pan-Americanism* is used interchangeably with *Monroeism* to mean *Yankee imperialism*, and regardless of the academic distinctions which have been made between the three terms, in the discussion which follows, we shall use this definition.

As a moderate epitome of this viewpoint an address most recently delivered by an Argentine author and critic, José Ingeniero, will be summarized:

"The famous doctrine of Monroe, which pretended for a century to guarantee our political independence from European aggression, is," he believes, "now revealed as the reserved right of North America to intervene among us." Concerning the future possibility of Latin America to withstand the aggressions of "the powerful neighbor and officious friend" he is most pessimistic. The United States is developing into a most rich and powerful country, whose capitalistic class will more and

⁸ Francisco García Calderón, *Latin America: its Rise and Progress* (English trans. by Bernard Miall, New York, 1913.), 298-312.

more demand greater fields for the operation of its syndicates. This class's aim is to capture the riches of Latin America as part of its scheme of seizing the riches of humanity. The grave hour when Latin America should give a decisive negative to the pretensions of North America has arrived. A vivid narrative of the "amputation" of Colombia, intervention in Nicaragua, the capture of Vera Cruz, the occupation of Haiti and Santo Domingo and the frustration of the Central American federation are given. South Americans should not be complacent because the North Americans have not as yet taken any of their territory; for south of the equator newspapers have been subsidized, secret negotiations favorable to North American tariff preferences are under way, and the baneful Yankee influence is seeping into society and politics. He dolefully asks, Is union possible in the face of the greedy northern ambition to possess our grains, coffee, sugar,—the enemies of our independence?⁹

A calmer and more critical exposition of Pan-Americanism is that of García Calderón. It is to him like the beneficent tyranny of Rome and the rude discipline of the Holy Alliance. He recognizes the good done by Yankee imperialists in Cuba, Central America and the other decadent communities of the tropics by the institution of order and sanitation. Yet he fears the greed of the Yankee financier and the ruthless manner in which the prideful Saxon is likely to deal with the mestizo. He looks with satisfaction on the rise of three self-respecting states in the south who will be able to deal on equal terms with the great republic. Señor García is very summary and grimly humorous in treating James G. Blaine, "the celebrated politician of imperial ambitions," and those who after him profess a hope of inter-American fraternity.¹⁰

In Fabela, a Mexican diplomat, Gandarilla, a Cuban writer and Turcios, a San Salvadorean poet, the opposition to the United States is characterized by hot personal resentment and moral condemnation. Pan-Americanism is to them what it is to the *New York Nation* or what slavery was to William Lloyd

⁹ *Nosotros*, Oct. 1922. For other statements of this view, see the files of *Reforma Social* and *Cuba Contemporánea*, both of Habana; and files of *Revista Filosófica* and *Nosotros*, both of Buenos Aires.

¹⁰ *op. cit.*, 310.

Garrison—not an inevitable problem of economic imperialism, but a problem of evil. Fabela believes that the Pan-American dialectics of Elihu Root have been absolutely contradicted by the Caribbean policy of the United States; the new era of brotherly relations announced by Philander C. Knox means the propagation of “Pan-Americanism in the Yankee sense of the word.” It is the acme of immorality for the North American statesmen to call a people whom they subjugate, brothers. He draws an odious parallel between Wilson’s professions of “co-operation without force” with the actual use of force by him towards the subjection of little Latin nations.¹¹ Gondarilla has hard words for the Yankee rulers of his *patria*. “Rapacity,” he avers, “is an instinct with the Yankee, and to satisfy it he prepares a feast which he devours as a vulture.” Against this “cannibal” he would have the Emperor of Japan act. The triumph of the nation of the east over the “huge pirate of the north” is to him a delicious hope.¹² Turcios in his denunciation of the Yankee writes with lyric fire. He sees no difference between the policies of the Democratic and Republican parties of the United States. He tells of Democratic acts of imperialism and the efforts of Democratic statesmen in behalf of “the Machiavellian scheme known as Pan-Americanism.” With a cry of despair he tells how the “frontier of death” i.e., that of Yankee domination, marches forward to devour his little country.¹³

Carlos Pereyra, an influential Mexican professor, with sardonic glee expresses his personal aversion for Woodrow Wilson and the theory and practice of his Pan-Americanism. He explains the alleged contradiction between the Wilson theory and practice as a contradiction in the character of the man, a contradiction which is characteristic of the North American people. A Presbyterian in morality and thought has made a successful combination with corrupt American politics and sordid American materialism. This combination of Puritanism

¹¹ Isidro Fabela, *Los Estados Unidos Contra La Libertad* (Barcelona, 1919), 217-219, 223.

¹² Julio César Gandarilla, *Contra el Yagui* (Habana, 1913), 10, 180-184.

¹³ Salvador Turcios R., *Al Margen del Imperialismo Yagui*. (San Salvador, 1915), 22-26.

with baseness explains the combination of idealistic phrase with brutal action, a combination on which the American people insisted.¹⁴

Aimed as a contradictory and positive substitute for Pan-Americanism is the propaganda for Pan-Hispanic solidarity, i.e., the propaganda for a closer union among the two Iberian nations of Europe and the Iberian nations of the New World. That this movement is essentially anti-Yankee in its purpose, is proven by the fact that each recrudescence of its activity has been at times when the Yankee hand fell hardest. In 1856, a time when Saxon filibusters were most active, several newspapers of Mexico City were most active in this cause, and the Spanish minister to Washington called a conference of Latin-American diplomats to form plans for coöperation with him against the danger which threatened their sovereignty and the sovereignty of Spain in Cuba and Porto Rico. Pan-Hispanism in its present form owes its existence to the humiliation which the proud Spanish nation suffered at the hands of the United States in 1898. In 1900 a great conference of all Iberian nations was held at the request of Spain for the purpose of devising some plan of coöperation through which Spain with the aid of her children could recover some of her lost glory.¹⁵ The same group of intelligent young Spaniards who have guided Spain to her present condition of comparative prosperity and who have made possible the literary Spain of Perez-Galdós, Pio Baroja, Azorin and Benavente, visioned a new imperial greatness for Spain in the union of the far-flung Spanish and Portuguese-speaking nations. Many causes for strife between the mother and her daughters had been overcome; Spain no longer had ambitions of reconquest; and she had extended belated recognition to the last of her former colonies. The common culture and race must be saved from the menace of the north. Spanish propagandists essayed to eradicate the sentimental attachment which their brothers in the race cherished for the republic of the north on account of a common republicanism and the memory of common action against monarchical imperialism.

¹⁴ Carlos Pereyra, *El Mito de Monroe* (Madrid, 1914), 449-458.

¹⁵ J. F. Rippy, *Political Science Quarterly*, Sept. 1922, pp. 389-392.

The response of Hispanic America to the Spanish proffers has been sufficient to give high hopes to the friends of Hispanic union. Since 1900 frequent conferences have been held.¹⁶ October 12, has been set aside in all Latin-American countries for the *Fiesta de la Raza*, that is, for the glorification of the achievements and possibilities of the Latin race. Latin-American and Iberian foreign offices have regaled each other with many lovely words. The fact that Don Pablo Morillo, a descendant of the general who sought to put down the efforts of Venezuela for independence, was the honored representative of the king of Spain at the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Venezuelan struggle for independence, illustrates to what extent the bitter memories of the past have been eradicated. Rafael Altamira, the greatest historian of Spain, and most distinguished advocate of Pan-Hispanism, in his progress through Latin America was received with a cordiality equal to that given Elihu Root. Historians in the ostensible interest of critical scholarship have revised earlier harsh opinions of Spanish colonial policy. Branches of Spanish learned societies have been established in the cities of the New World. Rubén Dario, José Santos Chocano, Rufino Blanco-Fombono, and José M. Vargas-Vila are among the more influential writers who have turned to the mother country for inspiration and to give praise.¹⁷

The great motive behind this propaganda is the cultural, racial, and linguistic identity which is alleged to exist among Spain, Portugal, and their former colonies. The Latin-American orator talks as frequently of his heritage of Latin blood and culture as does the orator of North America, of the Cavaliers and the Pilgrim Fathers. It is beside the point to argue that a certain Brazilian orator of pure African blood was not in fact descended from the Conscript Fathers, if he and thousands of other negroes, creoles and mestizos believe themselves to be of one race with the inhabitants of the Iberian countries.¹⁸ The sentiment of nationalism is based on the belief rather than the fact of ethnic identity.

¹⁶ The principle ones in 1900, 1908, 1911 and 1912.

¹⁷ Alfonso Robledo, *Una Lengua y Una Raza*, (Bogotá, 1918), 96-102; Rippey, *op. cit.*, 406.

¹⁸ Testimony of Gilbert Freyre.

As exponents of Pan-Hispanism I shall summarize the words of Fernando Berenguer, a Cuban, and Alfonso Robledo, a Colombian. The former discusses the doctrine as opposed to Pan-Americanism; the latter as a doctrine within itself. Pan-Hispanism, says Berenguer, is a union of race and culture which will grow with the growth of the nations of which it is composed. Pan-Americanism, on the other hand, is born of diplomatic artifice, of artificiality, of deliberate legal effort, and of the desire of the United States to control the less powerful states of America. It is made effective only by the will of the United States.¹⁹ Robledo's exposition consists largely of a glowing tribute to Spain and its history. That Spain since 1898 has abandoned the errors of the past is proven by her refusal to take a part in the War of the Nations. He minimizes the importance of the hardships of the Spanish colonial system, Spain's alleged cruelty in dealing with the American natives and her alleged zeal in behalf of obscurantism. Spain is the home of the immortal Cervantes and other great writers, of great historians and a wonderful language. To her, her daughters should turn for inspiration and leadership. He draws a vivid picture of Spain, the Good Mother, to whom her children in her hour of sore distress have rallied to give comfort and new life. It is a grand ambition to hope for the day when all the Latin nations of the New World will form one nation with the mother through the binding force of "one origin, one language, one custom."²⁰

A few general opinions as to the relative importance of the two doctrines which bid for the allegiance of Latin America are now in order. Which doctrine has the stronger hold on the Latin consciousness cannot be asserted with assurance. Lavish words, we have seen, have been uttered in behalf of both doctrines. Anti-Yankee opinions are only expressed by independent authors, the importance of whose opinions it is difficult to estimate. If responsible public officials cherish such opinions, they, on account of the international complications that would arise, are restrained from uttering them. Pan-Hispanism as the promoter of a sincere international fraternalism

¹⁹ Fernando Berenguer, *El Hispano-Americanismo* (Habana, 1918), 10-60.

²⁰ Alfonso Robledo, *op. cit.*, 10-51, 93 *et seq.*

—towards which both aspirations aim—has a distinct advantage over Pan-Americanism. Within the scope of its activities there is no state which is sufficiently powerful to have successful imperial ambitions over its fellows; within the bond of Pan-Americanism there is one nation which is sufficiently powerful to have already successfully asserted its will for territorial aggression. Between the ruling classes of Hispanic America and the people of Spain there is an identity of race and culture which is most likely in the future to have more weight than the counter-balancing influence of a common American republicanism. Yet from the pen of Rafael Altamira comes the admission that his cause has by no means triumphed over the North American influence. Writing in 1900 he aptly remarks that the Union of the Race must be built on foundations more substantial than lyrics, elegant orations and fond sympathy for the stricken mother country. There must be trade to offset the trade of North America; there must be liberal and staple governments to offset the sedulous admiration which Latin Americans then had for the great and liberal republic. The future of Latin America, he predicted, lay in the hands of business men, not in the hands of kind hosts and culturists. He admitted that in these respects Spain was at a distinct disadvantage. Writing sixteen years later he is not over-sanguine in his estimate of the progress achieved in Pan-Hispanization. He believes that America still fears the European menace, that the Great War has given the United States a great strategic advantage, and that Latin America still has an idolatrous admiration for the northern republic. He makes a strong plea for a greater cultural and economic interchange between Spain and Latin America,²¹ yet the relative percentage of commercial interchanges between Spain and Latin America has declined since 1897, while that of the United States has rapidly increased.²² Ideologists since the day of Bolivar have unceasingly advocated Latin federation, always with signal failure. Grave international jealousies continue to threaten the peace of South and Central America and national egotism is still rampant. Perhaps the aspirants after union among the Iberian nations

²¹ Compare *Cuestiones Hispano-Americanas* (Madrid, 1900), 23-58, with *Conferencia*, Jan. 24, 1916 (Madrid, 1916), 8-24.

²² Rippy, *op. cit.*, 414.

may be as futile in their efforts as the other dreamers of the ages who have vainly striven to rear super-states on the sands of liberal thought. We would certainly be most unwise to have high hopes for Pan-Hispanism until some effective organ of economic or political union is manifest.

The elimination of both Pan-Americanism and Pan-Hispanism as tangible realities of the future leads us to the conclusion that the international union which will bind the Americas will be a union of professed Pan-American fraternity and actual North American hegemony,—provided, of course, we assume there must be some sort of union. Since 1897 the United States has made vast economic and political strides towards the south. The future seems to hold in store for her greater surplus of goods for sale and capital for investment. Her scholars are informing her leaders as to the history and habits of the people of the south; her propagandists are justifying the wisdom of her actions. Backed by a uniformly patriotic democracy and an expanding navy, the American owners of capital and surplus commodities may reasonably be expected to utilize to the utmost the markets and wealth of South America. For us not to believe that they will act thus, is necessary to assume that the United States will in the future act above the rules which have guided this and other wealthy nations in the past.

Is Printed Drama Drama?

CHARLES E. WHITMORE

Northampton, Mass.

The question which I have set at the head of this paper is in a sense an anachronism; for there was a reading public for plays as early as the time of Euripides. Nevertheless, the invention of printing has done much to intensify the problems of the relation of specifically dramatic to general literary conditions, both by greatly increasing the number of plays read and by certain details of outward form. At the same time, the elements which underlie that problem strike so deep into the historic roots of the drama that some retrospect is needed before we can rightly estimate the problem as it exists today; for only so can we disentangle ideas which a too hasty generalizing has forced together. We must recall what drama is in itself before we can see what it becomes from the purely literary angle; and then we shall be able to discern what happens to drama when it is printed.

I

At the root of all drama as a separate art lie the twin elements of speech and spectacle. The former speaks for itself; under the latter fall the separate features of action and surroundings, the first of which is further divisible into action implied by the speeches and action implied by the situations. By "surroundings," again, we mean at first those in which the action is imagined as taking place, and next the theatrical conditions of the period in which the given play is produced. Drama, then, is a thing both seen and heard, but at first never heard without being seen; it goes on in a "seeing-place," a theatre, rude or highly developed as the case may be. Purely dramatic interest can be carried on by speeches, with the action implied in them; but it is likely also to elicit action from the situations, and to gain such help for illusion as the stage of the time affords. So much by way of initial reminder.

Now it is a sad but obvious fact that these elements of the drama are seldom content to maintain an equilibrium. The ideal of a perfect fusion between speech and spectacle is con-

tinually disturbed by the tendency of each to go its own way. Speech may claim everything for itself, and neglect the conditions amid which it is to be manifested; spectacle, in the desire for greater realism or for sheer splendor, may multiply the number of scenes and the elaboration of mounting until the weight of expense becomes insupportable. At times some external force holds the conflict in check; religious sentiment performed the service for early Greek drama and some phases of mediaeval, simplicity of stage setting performed it for the early Elizabethans. Yet, sooner or later, the conflict breaks out again; the desire for fullness of speech is ill at ease amid theatrical limitations, and those limitations may in their turn lead to the sacrifice of literary excellence. All drama is in a sense a compromise, and, like all compromises, it finds exact balance hard to maintain.

But this inherent conflict is not the only one to which drama is exposed; it is also unstable in its relation to its own time and in its relation to other forms of literary activity. In periods during which it is a dominant literary type, it will yield to the "form and pressure" of the time, including in its scope motives and pie pieces of information which a stricter taste would rule out as "undramatic." In periods when it is more self-conscious, it may be ready to undergo the influence of other forms than the dramatic, and to be more or less affected thereby. As illustrating the first, we recall how much past and current history was roughly cut and patched into scenes for Elizabethan audiences, and, in an intermediate way, how the traits of the Athenian law-courts are reflected in Euripides, in the sharp opposition of characters and motives, in the love of set speeches and formal debates, in the fondness for settling points by argument. As for the specifically literary interactions, we shall encounter and estimate some of them a little further on.

In view of these several conflicts, it is not strange that theories of the drama should find difficulty in adjusting all the elements with which they have to deal. The earliest extant discussion of the matter, that of Aristotle in his *Poetics*, shows the problem clearly present, though not frankly faced, much less solved. By relegating spectacle to the portion of the dramatic field least concerned with art, Aristotle succeeds in at-

tenuating the vigor of its conflict with literary excellence; but uncertainty as to the place of representation as a constituent factor in a truly dramatic result embroils the situation. We are told, in one place, that the tragic effect is possible without representation and actors, and again that the plot should be so constructed that even one who merely heard the story of the events should be moved with terror and pity at them, as would happen to one who heard the story of Oedipus. This of course means failure to distinguish between narrative effects in general and dramatic effects in particular, and would, if logically carried out, reduce all plays to the level of mere scenarios. But the famous definition expressly stipulates that tragedy should be presented by characters in action, not by narration; the test of actual effectiveness in performance is appealed to in support of the contention that plays with unhappy endings are the most tragic; and, still more significantly, we are told that in constructing and working out his plot the dramatist should visualize as much as possible, both to enhance vividness and to avoid awkwardness on the stage. This recognition of the fact that the dramatist must, at least as a practical necessity, be able to visualize his situations in terms of the theatre as he knows it will reveal its full importance only at a later stage of our discussion.

Thus far we have not attempted to distinguish between the play as staged and the play as written down; and we must now see what is implied in the latter step. The reasons for writing down a play are at the outset purely practical. As soon as the stage of pure improvisation is passed, repetition, or even first production, is scarcely feasible without some written record. This, in its simplest form, is merely the scenario of a performance, related to the latter precisely as written music is related to that actually heard, and as little as written music an end in itself. It will serve its purpose if it contains only the speeches which the performers are to utter, especially if they imply enough action to carry the play along. But it may also, as a guide to convenient repetition, note any elaborate or successful bit of action, or some hint of locality. When stage conditions are relatively simple, as they were in ancient Greece, speeches by themselves may suffice, as is the case with the Greek plays

as they have come down to us. "Prompter's copies" doubtless existed in antiquity, though they have not survived; yet even to-day we can in most cases make out the action with sufficient clearness. When, however, conditions are more complicated, stage directions naturally spring up beside speeches, and furnish the germ of a double development, the full import of which we shall see before long.

As soon as a play is written down, its status undergoes certain changes. It may, of course, go on serving a purely utilitarian need, that of aiding performances at places other than its point of origin; but it may also begin to stand on its own feet as a piece of literature. Thereby it takes on a two-fold character. On the one hand, it gives the writer a freer rein for developing a purely literary expressiveness, on the other it can be read without much consciousness of its original connection with the theatre; and while publication in one sense stabilizes and safeguards the text, in another it marks a possible reinforcement of the disintegrating forces already, as we saw, present in the dramatic form itself. Those tendencies are apparent before there is any question of general publication; but the effect of such publication is on the whole to encourage them, unless the initial dramatic impulse can retain its strength. In other words, both writer and reader may be tempted to abandon the conviction that what they are dealing with is drama in the stricter sense; and it is worth while to see a little more closely how this comes about.

This temptation may come to the dramatist from dissatisfaction with the medium in which he is to work. Theatrical conditions are, rather obviously, limitations, and limitations sometimes peculiarly galling to a writer of literary sensitiveness. Actors wilfully dock and interpolate; audiences clamor for happy endings, or miss subtle points, or take things in the wrong way. So the playwright may, like Ben Jonson, be fain to "leave the loathed stage" and seek refuge in the printed word. If, in so doing, he remains a dramatist at all, he will want to preserve his work as nearly as possible in its originally intended shape; but he will tend to include much which the limitations of the stage would have forced him to keep out, and to allow the influence of non-dramatic forms. If this infiltration goes far

enough, he may depart from the dramatic ideal even while he still seems to remain within its boundaries, and still more so when he oversteps them. In other words, the drama breaks up not only in consequence of its own unstable equilibrium, but because of a definite external force.

There may be much variety both in the nature of such intrusions and in the degree to which they affect the dramatic fabric. A salient example, which will serve as a type of many, is afforded us by the just mentioned Ben Jonson. Led by his strong bent for satire, he incorporated into several of his plays the device of the "character," or descriptions of a person in terms of a group of salient general characteristics. In *Every Man Out of His Humour* each member of the dramatis personae is described in a brief epigrammatic paragraph; in *Cynthia's Revels* characters are described by their fellows in the course of the action; in *The Magnetic Lady* a pair of such descriptions are forced to break the dramatic illusion for deliberate comic effect. When Compass has given his "character" of Parson Palate, his friend Ironside asks, "Who made this epigram, you?" and the reply is, "No, a great clerk as any is of his bulk, Ben Jonson, made it." Here we have the device in the three stages of something extraneous to the play except as printed, of something inserted, and of something which actually breaks the dramatic fabric.

So much for the temptations which the written play affords its writer; we must now glance at its possible effect on the reader. Obviously, any play that is written down can be read for its own sake, for the inherent interest of its plot or the beauty of its phrasing. Further, just as it is advantageous for the writer of a play to visualize his material as he works, so it is advantageous for the reader to do the same as he reads. But just what do we here mean by "visualizing?" Is reading a play like reading anything else, or does it give an effect peculiar to itself? In reading many kinds of descriptive or narrative writing, we try to visualize; do we do anything different in reading a play? The answer surely is that in the latter case we try to visualize in a determined fashion. And what determines that fashion is simply the stage of any given period, whether our own or an older one recalled for artistic purposes. Where

stage conditions are simple and familiar, this may be accomplished automatically; where they are more complex or special, the reader may require the aid of stage directions. This may seem a simple matter; yet, as we shall now see, modern conditions have raised it to the dignity of one of those "art-casuistries" which Pater thought essential to the framing of any sound aesthetic theory.

II

The origin of stage directions is the practical need of indicating significant action in the play as written down. When, as often, the situation itself generates the action as a spontaneous outcome, directions may be needless. But any specially effective bit of action may be noted for convenience of repetition; still more do the entrances and exits which punctuate the action (just as commas and periods punctuate sentences) need to be noted, and the omission of them may cause obscurity. But such directions are not the whole story. As there is differentiation in the dramatic substance, so there is a corresponding differentiation in the directions; and accordingly we may find designation of locality, sometimes hardly more than the equivalent of a sign-board, and descriptions of locality, to facilitate stage setting. All these types correspond to different aspects of the element of spectacle.

Utilitarian directions are normally in prose, often of a more or less stenographic kind. This differentiates them in part from prose speeches, and still more from speeches in verse; but the differentiation can be only partial. To revert to our former parallel between written plays and written music: in the latter case the words which indicate tempo or expression are obviously distinct from the notes, whereas in the former we must use words for both speech and direction. To put it otherwise, what in the enstaged play is conveyed by two sensory channels—speeches by sound, spectacle by sight—is in the written play conveyed by but one. In prose plays as printed the difference of function is shown by variety of disposition and of type-size; in verse plays it is further shown by the difference between prose and verse itself. The mediaeval writer, to be sure, had another resource—he could write his text in the vernacular and

his directions in Latin; but his example could hardly be imitated today. The modern writer will naturally choose one of two lines: he may either let the directions stand because of their convenience, as a running commentary, or (especially in poetic drama) he may reduce them to a minimum, or even allow them to be largely absorbed into descriptive speeches. This latter device, though it may in part be derived from the classical practice of narrating events that occur off-stage, or from a desire to compensate for deficiencies in stage setting, is in its result a legitimate means of making the literary fabric as homogeneous as possible. We may have poetic drama in which the directions no more call attention to themselves as a separable element than do the commas in a sentence, or *pp* and *ff* in a musical score.

The nature of the stage direction has naturally changed with the growth and change of the drama to which it belongs. Since, as we have seen, Greek drama provides us with no material for its study, a survey of actual examples must begin with the Middle Ages. There, when the dramatic impulse first begins to emerge amid the services of the Church in the form of Christmas and Easter tropes, it is accompanied by directions of the purely utilitarian sort, designed, like any other rubrics, to direct the clergy in the due performance of ritual act. But before long directions appear which are evidently intended to enhance the effectiveness of stage performance as such. The plays have migrated from church to square, have become largely secular in appeal; it is therefore not strange that directions should conspicuously alter. Sometimes they are very brief; but in other cases they attain considerable dimensions, reaching the greatest elaboration in the twelfth century Anglo-Norman play of *Adam*. It will be worth while to quote the careful specifications with which the play opens.

Let Paradise be made in a fairly high place; let curtains and silk clothes be hung around it, at such a height that the persons who shall be in Paradise can be seen from the shoulders upward; let fragrant flowers and leaves be strewn about it; let there be in it divers trees with fruits hanging from them, that the place may seem as charming as possible. Then let the Saviour come, clad in a dalmatic, and let Adam and Eve stand beside him. Let Adam be clad in a red tunic, and Eve in woman's

garb of white, with a white silk cloak, and let them both stand beside the Figure, Adam nearer, with a composed countenance, Eve with one somewhat more submissive. And let Adam be well taught when he is to reply, lest he be either too quick or too slow in replying. And not only he, but all the actors, should be so taught that they may speak composedly, and make gestures appropriate to the matter of which they speak; and in the verses let them neither add nor take away a syllable, but one and all firmly pronounce and say in order what they have to say.

There can be no question that this indicates the work of a writer keenly alive to the problems of actual presentation; and straight through the play the action is directed by a similar commentary. The point to notice at present is that though those directions were in origin utilitarian, yet their effect when read is to help us visualize action and setting, so that they become an active aid to our enjoyment. Thanks to them, we can mentally reconstruct stage and surroundings, and so the better conceive the play in theatrical terms, not as a mere sequence of speeches which might be delivered anywhere. At the same time, since the directions do owe their origin to the theatrical exigencies of a specific period, they are of one piece with the speeches, and take their place within the limits of the whole. They are not an intrusion, but an outgrowth.

With the Elizabethan age and its immense body of material, preserved to us by the invention of printing, we find a closer approximation to modern conditions, but still much variation in detail. The scant regard in which plays were often held caused many of them to find their way into print casually or surreptitiously, as the barest scenarios, even their text often sorely mangled, and stage directions either docked or omitted altogether. But with the growth of literary self-consciousness after the turn into the seventeenth century some playwrights took pains to print their works with the aim of securing a more intelligent reception, or of adding portions altered or cut down in the acting. Yet the speeches remain the dominant element, and directions are relatively undeveloped, except in the case of one form—the masque. Here the action was always quite as important as the speeches, and often more so; hence a printed masque necessarily included very elaborate directions. But this abundance is as purely practical as is the corresponding

abundance of rubrics in early liturgical drama; it is designed to guide the performance of intricate movements and dances. In reading a masque, we naturally visualize the scene; but we do so only as we may visualize the results of any set of directions which sufficiently interest us. The effect is not altered by the amount.

If, now, we contrast a recent printed play with a classical or an Elizabethan one, we are pretty sure to be struck by the quantity of directions, and that not only here and there, but gathered into sizable blocks at the beginnings of acts. If we ask what has happened, the answer is simple. Between the subsidence of the drama at the end of the eighteenth century and its revival a few decades ago lies the entire multifarious development of modern fiction, one of the most extraordinary cases of expansion recorded in literary history. In the Elizabethan period prose fictional narrative was in its infancy, and could at best be a purveyor of plot material to the drama; now the position is reversed. Then, the dominance of the drama led almost all writers to try their hands at it; now, the novel occupies the post of command. So the native instability of the drama is confronted by a perturbing force of such magnitude as it has never encountered before, and the resulting interactions are of the highest interest to the student of literary theory.

The influence of novel on drama is written large on the pages of our contemporary playwrights. Many are the speeches and dialogs that strike us as more at home on the printed page than in the give-and-take of actual presentation; and the lengthy descriptions of persons and places which greet us in the works of Mr. Shaw or Mr. Barker are even more eloquent of the connection. For that matter, Mr. P. P. Howe has acutely pointed out that Shaw was novelist before he was dramatist, and that his elaborate directions are direct transfers from the method of his novels. While it is true that many plays are still printed in the form of scenarios, with directions of the purely utilitarian sort, it is equally true that others make an appeal to the reader which is at first sight almost indistinguishable from the appeal of the novel itself. We must therefore face the question whether, somewhere along the line between these two extremes, the original dramatic intention has

been quitted for good and all, or whether we are still justified in speaking of "drama" even when the initial conditions of that form have long been left behind.

A few points, at all events, our survey thus far has made reasonably clear. A dramatic intention, so long as it deserves the name, must show the marks of the theatrical conditions amid which it first arose and to which it submitted. But if even stage plays can exhibit traits foreign to the stricter dramatic ideal, much more will printed plays tend to accept non-dramatic impulses, and to ignore necessary restrictions. The purely literary stage is not the theatrical stage, and the manipulator of it may lose touch with the "idea" of the stage entirely, and appeal to the reader as reader pure and simple. Yet, if the dramatic feeling survives at all, neither writer nor reader can visualize in the void; the former must know for what sort of stage his effects are calculated, the latter must have something equally definite and familiar into which to expand the hints given by the directions. But since, finally, no conscientious writer wishes to split up his literary medium if he can help it, the question of the equivalence of acted and written drama takes this new shape: Can features determined by the generating conditions of one medium be transferred intact to another? It has been held that they can; and if that view is sound, it is obvious that written or printed drama can exist as an autonomous form of art, without regard to the parallel drama that is still fettered to the stage. To see if this view is sound is our next task.

III

The two writers who have most vigorously championed this new conception of the drama are Mr. John Drinkwater in his introduction to the dramatic works of St. John Hankin, and Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie in his book on Thomas Hardy. Mr. Drinkwater's contention is that the new type of stage direction, the rise of which we have just been tracing, meets a genuine dramatic need, that of deliberate commentary—a need met by the chorus in Greek drama, and also, more clumsily, by the Elizabethan soliloquy. "Shakespeare felt the artistic necessity of commenting on his creations, but in blurring the dividing

line between his dramatic and choric statement he deprived his audience of help to which it has a legitimate claim" (p. 15). But the new dramatists, feeling an artistic desire for argument that was explicit, "invented the stage direction. Not the old direction that set out a stage and brought people on to it and off again, but a new full-fledged thing that enabled them to do something which their art compelled them to do" (p. 16).

The claim of novelty for this procedure is, as we saw, largely justified; but the claim that it originates from a purely dramatic need is much more dubious. Take the example from St. John Hankin which Mr. Drinkwater goes on to offer in support of his contention:

GENERAL BONSOR [*too broken with the world's ingratitude to protest further*]. Boring! [*Follows MISS TRIGGS, shaking her poor old head. There is a pause, while we realize that one of the most tragic things in life is to be a bore—and to know it.*] "That," says Mr. Drinkwater, "is pure chorus, and nothing else." To which the only reply, it seems to me, is, "No, it is pure novel." When Mr. Drinkwater goes on to adduce some of Mr. Yeats' character, and the Gaffer of Mr. Masefield's *Nan*, as further instances of the same elemental desire, I confess that I lose touch with him. An actual character in a play fulfilling a function analogous to that of a chorus is one thing, a direction on a printed page is quite another; and how Mr. Drinkwater expects the transition from page to stage to be effected, he does not in the least explain. His own printed plays, it is amusing to note, exhibit only directions of the strictest utilitarian type.

Mr. Abercrombie's view, based on a much more radical contention, seems to break down through a somewhat similar lapse of logic. In writing of Mr. Hardy's *The Dynasts*, he has to meet the objection that the work, though cast in dramatic form, could obviously never be enstaged; and his rebuttal cannot be fairly represented except by fairly extensive quotation.

This seems the place to consider briefly two more general accusations which have been brought against *The Dynasts*. The first is merely theoretical. The poem is in the form of a play; but it is not for the stage. Hardy himself has thought it worth while to notice in his preface the resulting objection. The question, as he properly observes, "seems

to be an unimportant matter of terminology." And it might be added that to condemn a drama as art because it is not meant for the stage is to ignore astonishingly the actual facts of artistic experience. It is to ignore the fact that man can read. For, through being able to read, he has added to himself a special faculty for visualization; and the man for artistic theory to consider nowadays is a man possessing this faculty and giving it aesthetic exercise. Poetry was instant to take advantage of the faculty as soon as it appeared; and there can be no real reason why dramatic poetry should be excluded from an advantage derived from something which is now an integral part of human nature. The spoken word must always remain the prime material of poetry; the thing is, that the poet can trust a cultivated reader to supply mentally the spoken word to the written. And when it comes to the action of drama, obviously his visualizing faculty, due to the habit of reading can do things quite beyond the range of stage performance. It enables Hardy to show his reader the whole of Europe at one view "as a prone and emaciated figure, the Alps shaping like a backbone, and the branching mountain chains like ribs, the peninsular plateau of Spain forming a head;" to show also "the peoples" of this Europe, "distressed by events which they did not cause, writhing, crawling, heaving and vibrating in their various cities and nationalities;" and then to fill the scene with "a new and penetrating light, endowing men and things with a seeming transparency," an anatomy which reveals "all humanity and vitalized matter" as a single organism urged by the primal impulse. Why should this be improper in art? Why should the great formal advantages of dramatic shape be confined to plays capable of being staged? The matter, perhaps, need not be considered further. But it may be remarked that when we read "Prometheus Bound," and when we read *The Dynasts*, our brains work in precisely the same way; the fact that "Prometheus Bound" was originally a stage play is, artistically, no concern of ours whatever. Yet the theorists who condemn *The Dynasts* would never think of passing the same sentence on "Prometheus Bound" merely because the latter *has been* staged. That sufficiently shows the absurdity of this theory. It is not its fitness for the stage that makes drama good; but it is the presence in it of certain formal virtues which makes drama good for the stage, or good for reading, or good for both. That a play on the stage may be more impressive than a play in an arm-chair is another matter altogether; but that does not mean at all that the visualizing faculty of literate mankind should not possess its own kind of drama.

The course of the argument seems clear; yet closer inspection shows, I think, that it shifts ground during its course. No one denies that visualization plays a great part in modern literature, or that it "can do things quite beyond the range of stage performance;" but in that case, why try to maintain the contact

with the stage at all? Or again, can we preserve "the great formal advantages of dramatic shape" when we have cut loose from the very conditions which have created that shape? As for the parallel with the *Prometheus*, we need only ask whether that play bears more than the remotest outward resemblance to the *Dynasts*. And we may perfectly well admit the conclusion that "the visualizing faculty of literate mankind should possess its own kind of drama" without admitting that such drama can be attained by breaking with the environment in which all drama has assumed its characteristic form.

Continuing his line of argument, Mr. Abercrombie encounters the matter of stage directions, and proceeds to tell us what will happen to them under the new conditions.

A thing, however, which may be more seriously objected to *The Dynasts* is that it preserves unnecessarily a convention which belongs merely to the writing down of stage plays—the practice of putting dialogue in verse, directions in prose. Strictly, drama, whether on the stage or in an arm-chair, consists in performance. The performance of a stage-play is made up of spoken words and visible action; but since action cannot be written down, the poet gives a few notes in prose roughly to indicate what he designs. But in a play intended solely for mental performance there seems no reason why this convenience should persist. The written poetry of the dialogue has to provoke the mental performance of spoken poetry; which, again, is only a means of conveying the characters and feelings of the persons. But if poetry is on the whole a more potent means of doing this than prose, why not employ it also for the stage directions? These have to provoke a mental performance of the action; and surely for this, as for dialogue, the most efficient medium would be poetry; especially when the directions are as elaborate and significant as those of *The Dynasts*. The poem in scope and substance takes notable advantage of the freedom possible in purely mental drama; but it has not tested to the full the capabilities of this kind of literature. That remains to be done, by putting the whole of it—dialogue, action, and setting—into poetry.

But so long as a direction is a direction at all, its function, as we have seen, must differ radically from the function of the speeches, and there seems no valid reason why this difference of function should not be expressed by a difference of form. The course which Mr. Abercrombie advocates would result in uniformity, not true unifying. As a matter of fact, the experiment was actually made, in a small way, in half-forgotten

George Darley's almost forgotten *Sylvia*; and it is perhaps significant that it incited no imitators. Mr. Abercrombie, going on to note that "the prose directions of *The Dynasts* are just as vivid and provocative as the poetry" (they are really much more so, as he himself elsewhere admits), is forced by his own attitude to consider this an "anomaly," and thereby lets the cat out of the bag. The directions show the best traits of Hardy the novelist, in a form which by its compulsory brevity forbids digression. But their virtues owe nothing else to the dramatic form, and that fact, I believe, effectively "spikes" Mr. Abercrombie's argument. What he calls an anomaly is only what any attentive reader of Hardy's work would expect.

Thus the arguments of our two critics, designed to show us that modern stage directions have endowed the drama with a new means of expression, really prove that the alleged innovation is borrowed from the novel; that it owes to the novel whatever expressional value it has, and that it marks a departure from the true dramatic field. We have travelled beyond the limits of performance, whether actual or possible, and have thereby hopelessly shattered the unity and continuity of the form; for Mr. Abercrombie's use of the term "performance" is utterly equivocal. Yet the very existence of printed drama in its present abundance suggests the presence of a genuine need for a new mode of expression. It is our final task to see that this need not only can be but actually has been, met.

IV

The writer who has supplied the solution in question is Henry James; and the record of his reactions to the theatre, as set forth in his recently published letters, is of peculiar interest to us. In 1872, as a young and enthusiastic traveller in Europe, he could write, "An acted play is a novel intensified; it realizes what the novel suggests; and by paying a liberal tribute to the senses anticipates your possible complaint that your entertainment is of the meagre sort styled 'intellectual'" (*Transatlantic Sketches*, p. 99). But in 1893, after assaying this intensification of the novel, he writes to his brother William in terms of bitter disillusionment: "The whole odiousness of the thing lies in the connection between the drama and the theatre. If the

drama could only be theoretically or hypothetically acted, the fascination resident in its all but unconquerable form would be unimpaired, and one would be able to have the exquisite exercise without the horrid sacrifice" (*Letters*, I, p. 211). It might have been predicted that a writer of James' complex and fastidious temperament would have come to loathe the stage with an intensity surpassing even Ben Jonson's; yet the artist in him was perpetually fascinated by the problem which his actual plays, as given in *Theatricals*, could but thinly meet. What, then, did he do?

He adopted the only course for a writer who was keenly conscious of the validity of literary distinctions. Recognizing that his motives would be most at home in the novels, and yet unwilling to forego the "exquisite exercise" of drama, he did not shatter the dramatic form in the attempt to make it accommodate an alien aim. Instead, he adopted a policy of conciliation. He used the form of the novel, but he infused into it all the dramatic implications it would hold, at the same time keeping fast to the notion of a realizable performance. He has himself lucidly described the process in a single instance, that of *Covering End*: "With the little play, the absolute creature of its conditions, I had simply to make up a deficit and take a small *révanche*. For three mortal years had the actress for whom it was written (utterly to try to *fiat*) persistently failed to produce it, and I couldn't wholly waste my labor. The B[ritish] P[ublic] won't read a play with the mere names of the speakers—so I simply paraphrased these and added such indications as might be the equivalent of decent acting—a history and an evolution that seem to me moreover explicatively and sufficiently smeared all over the thing" (*Letters*, I, p. 299).

Such is the method, which he adapted to the purpose of intellectual farce in *Covering End*, of an approach to tragedy in *The Other House*, and of high comedy in the most finished example of all, *The Outcry*. For our purpose, two aspects of it are of special importance. In the first place, it secures, by the transfer of dramatic elements to a new medium, continuity of style. The directions are absorbed into the whole, and no longer obtrude themselves as a separable element. To read the book

which most fully displays the method—*The Outcry*—is to receive a unique pleasure, and to receive it through a perfectly homogeneous medium. There is no skipping back and forth between speeches and directions; fine rich phrases replace the monotonous *enter, exit, re-enter*. Moreover, the structure provides as much food for visualization as one could wish. The book falls into three long chapters, which are acts; within each, the entrance of a new character marks a new section or scene; and each ends with a sharply defined situation or gesture. And this brings us to the second merit of the method—that it does not attempt to proserve “the great formal advantages of dramatic shape” while cutting from the conditions in which those advantages arose. It aims not at a disembodied mental performance, but at an inclusion of such directions as shall be “the equivalent of decent acting.” It is hard to see how the unity which Mr. Abercrombie desires could be better attained, or how, for that matter, it could be attained in any other way whatever.

Indeed, if we are right in holding, on the strength of our previous analysis, that printed drama should enable the reader to visualize in terms of the theatrical conditions with which he is familiar, and that only so can it truly add to his aesthetic enjoyment, we cannot fail to see that James’ solution makes for unity as the projects of Mr. Drinkwater and Mr. Abercrombie emphatically do not. Neither unlimited comment by the author nor the appeal to the reader merely as reader can effect a fusion between the dramatic and the narrative appeals. Such a fusion can be brought about only by encouraging visualization in a determined way, which will be either the reconstruction of a stage from verbal hints, or the general visualizing of the novel. If the latter path be chosen, there can be no valid reason for retaining the dramatic scheme at all, for prose narrative can certainly be as vivid as its writer can make it, and can display “formal advantages” too, if he has the ability to compass them. Of course, the interchange between novel and play has not been wholly one-sided. The novel has in these latter years learned much from the drama, and it would be an interesting task to collect instances of the reciprocal influence, such as the

dividing of a story into sections corresponding to the acts and scenes of a play. The procedure of Henry James would have especial interest in this connection; but that must be a task for another occasion.

Thus we see that, so far as the stage direction in particular is concerned, the only way to turn it to new uses is to let it revert to the novel, and there be absorbed. If left in a play, it must either be true to its utilitarian origin, in which case there can be no question of novelty, or belie it, in which case it means a false departure. It cannot, while preserving its true nature, serve as an indefinitely expanding channel for author's comment; it will not, however disguised, melt into the fabric of poetic drama, from the poetic element of which it must always be distinct. Its expansion, if allowed to follow its true bent, can lead only to the novel which suggested it, there to give a fresh impulse to that indefinitely elastic form. In that capacity it will allow the playwright to avoid the bitter questions of expense which attend the mounting of a modern production, and the consequent interference with artistic ends which Henry James found so loathsome. But thereby the directions as such will have been quietly absorbed into the general texture, and our little problem will have ceased to exist.

We are left, however, with the broader question with which we began, and must in conclusion ask again in what sense printed drama is drama at all. The answer, in the light of our previous examination, is easy to give—printed drama remains drama in intention just so long as it looks outward to a performance in realizable stage conditions, and, while waiting for that possibility to become actual, loyally abides by the restrictions which such performance imposes. Meanwhile, it may very well appeal to the visualizing power of a reader, if only the appeal be frankly made. "The dance alone," says Mallarmé, "by the fact of its evolution, seems to me to necessitate a real space, or a stage. Strictly speaking, paper suffices to evoke any piece; anyone, aided by his multiple personality, being able to enact it inwardly, which is not the case when it is a question of pirouettes." But all power of strictly dramatic visualization would be in vain, if it were not applied to material already

selected and arranged in accordance with the conditions developed and imposed by the dramatic form itself. A play may accept readers while it awaits performance; it may even find in that acceptance a compensation for the evils of excessive cost and mechanical limitation that beset the theatre today. There is a choice, and either path may be chosen; but the paths lead in different directions. No mere typographical distribution can cause a play to be really dramatic, or conceal the dramatic intention in such a novel as *The Outcry*. "Closet drama," no doubt, we shall have always with us; but a play which seeks and finds readers does not thereby cease to be a play, if dramatic vigor pervades it. In short, printed drama can be drama.

Byron and Goethe

CHARLES A. KRUMMEL

Trinity College

As we approach the year 1924 and with it the centennial anniversary of Lord Byron's death, it is only natural that we should recall and study more closely his relations to other great men of his day. Among these there is none to whom he sustained so unique a relation as to his German contemporary, Goethe.

On the surface, however, one finds very little that would justify such an investigation between these two poets. They never met, had no personal dealings whatsoever, and the extent of their direct correspondence amounts to a single letter by Byron written hastily in answer to a greeting from Goethe expressed in the form of a short poem of three stanzas. Radical differences in nationality and descent, a period of forty years in age, and opposite polarity in mental as well as temperamental constitution separated them as far as the East is from the West. When a mutual relation between them began to exist, Goethe had already reached his biblically allotted three score years and ten. He enjoyed the love, respect, and homage of his entire people, and was comfortably settled for the remainder of his life in the idyllic city of classic Weimar. For him the doubts, storms and catastrophes of life had long been subdued into a harmonious calm that has become proverbial and has found no equal among men of letters; while the young, impetuous, revolutionary British outcast, as if on the wings of genius, was making his illustrious flight through Europe. Yet these two poets, coming from, and with such wide extremes, must be linked together to occupy the first two places in the literary world of their day. The point of interest, however, in their relations to each other is not to be found in the influence that may have passed between them, but rather in the understanding and estimate that they had of each other.

It is rather unfortunate that Byron had only very limited and indirect information concerning Goethe and his works. Medwin, in his *Conversations with Byron* (1-131), records the

following statement by the poet: "When I was a boy I studied German, which I have now entirely forgotten. It was very little I ever knew of it." And again in his diary for January 12, 1881 he continues: "I have read nothing of Mueller and less of Goethe, and Schiller, and Wieland, than I could wish. I only know them through English, French, and Italian translations. Of the real language I know absolutely nothing except oaths learned from postillions and officers in a squabble; I can swear in German potently when I like—Sakrament—Verfluchter—Hundsfoth—and so forth! But I have little of their less energetic conversation."

Although for purely practical purposes Byron seems to have had all the German he needed, he nevertheless expressed repeatedly a deep longing for its literature, and primarily for that of Goethe. In 1822 he said to Medwin: "I have great curiosity about everything relating to Goethe and please myself with thinking there is some analogy between us. So much interest do I take in him that I offered to give 100 pounds to any person who would translate his memoirs for my own reading. He seems to be very superstitious, and is a believer in astrology or rather was, for he was very young, when he wrote the first part of his life. I would give the world to read Faust in the original."

This passage is very significant for various reasons. In the first place, it reveals an almost naive ignorance of the external facts about Goethe and his writings, for the memoirs, here referred to, can be nothing else than the autobiographical production called *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, which Goethe wrote when he was over sixty years old. And to accuse Goethe of superstition and belief in astrology is almost equally as ridiculous. On the other hand, it also shows that Byron knew where the great personality, as well as the essential poetic message of Goethe were to be found, and he was exceedingly anxious to know both. About the only purely fictitious works of Goethe which Byron actually knew were *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, and *Faust*. Here, no doubt, lies the secret of the strange attraction of Goethe for Byron. In these two productions there is indeed very much of the revolutionary spirit, of bitter contempt for worn-out convention, of unbridled ambition

and of passionate longing for the infinite—in short the typical “Storm and Stress” spirit that animated the youthful German poet in his first literary efforts.

Goethe, on the other hand, in connection with his study of Shakespeare, had early acquired a ready knowledge of the English language, which enabled him to get his information concerning Byron and his works directly and unadulterated. This fundamental difference makes the whole relation between these two poets somewhat unbalanced, for Goethe was much more concerned about Byron than Byron was about Goethe.

Although the German poet had now attained to a state of serene harmony within himself, he was by no means dead to the spirit of revolution and reform. In fact he was still a reformer as he had always been. His method, to be sure, was now wisely adapted to his position and station in life. He was now working in a purely constructive way. But he still saw room and need for a more radical and incisive attack than he himself in his country was able to make. In Byron he now saw the phenomenon of a great and genuine poetic genius who reproduced in striking and original manner, even in magnified proportions, the “Storm and Stress” period of his own youth.

This passionate longing to solve the mysteries of life, this Promethean defiance of convention and cant, and above all, this undaunted courage and indomitable will, so evident in all of Byron's works, at once arrested the attention and commanded the respect of the elder poet. It was at this time that Goethe used sane judgment in his attitude toward Byron. At this particular time, when all that was virile in the declining order of aristocratic and monarchical rule was fast congealing and dying; when about the only thing that was aggressively alive was the apparent monstrosity of Napoleon, and he, too, in the end had proved a disappointment; when on this scene there appeared the revolutionizing and vitalizing force of Byron,—I repeat,—it revealed good judgment on the part of Goethe, who was now an evolutionist rather than a revolutionist, that he at once welcomed this new scion with open arms and threw all the wisdom, dignity, and accumulated momentum of his great personality into the balance in order to give this daring

but brilliant "castaway" a fair chance on the European continent, if not in the entire world of letters.

Yet with all this, his insight was clear and discriminating, and by no means blind to the dangers and faults of his youthful admirer. To be sure, in his public utterances he did not do Byron the injustice of emphasizing his faults unduly. That, he observed, was more than sufficiently done by others who saw in Byron little or nothing of his good qualities. In Goethe's private letters and conversations, especially with Eckermann, in February, 1825, he expressed himself in no uncertain terms concerning the reckless life of the English poet. Here he shows surprise that Byron, "who never submitted to, or cared for any law, should in his dramas have submitted to that most stupid law of the three unities." And adds: "If only Byron had also understood how to keep within the proper limits in the moral sphere! That he was unable to do this, was his ruin . . . That reckless mode of life drove him away from England, and would in the course of time also have driven him from Europe. In spite of boundless personal liberty, he felt confined everywhere; the world was a prison to him."

Although Goethe has been described, at this stage of his life, as a man of almost statue-like poise, he was still sufficiently human not to turn a deaf ear to the news of Byron's divorce scandal. On October 25, 1816, two American students of the University of Göttingen, George Ticknor and Edward Everett, called upon Goethe, and among other things, including several copies of Byron's latest poems, brought the news of his unhappy separation. To this the old Sage of Weimar, in his characteristically calm fashion, replied: "In its circumstances and the mystery in which it is involved, it is so poetical, that if Lord Byron had invented it, he could scarcely have had a more fortunate subject for his genius." (*Conversations with Eckermann* III; 271.)

Goethe's estimate of Byron's individual works is to be traced largely in the literary reviews which appeared in his own periodical, *Kunst und Alterthum*. The first of Byron's works to be reviewed in this magazine was *Manfred*, which because of the similarity of its theme to that of *Faust*, called forth extensive comment by Goethe. The review is full of enthusiastic

appreciation, without any charge whatsoever of plagiarism or literary borrowing. As a conclusion Goethe gives his own translation of Manfred's monologue, beginning: "We are fools of time and error," which he recommends for dramatic reading since it, in his opinion, surpasses in intensity even the monologue of Hamlet. Unfortunately this review did not reach Byron until three years later in Ravenna. Catching the meaning of only a few such words as "hypocondrisch" and "melancholie," he at once concluded that the review was unfavorable. In his letter to Hoppner, May 25, 1820, he says: "I shall regret this, for I should have been proud of Goethe's good opinion, but I shan't alter my opinion of him, even though he should be savage." To his friends he frankly admitted some similarity between the first scene of his *Manfred* and that of *Faust*, but when later English reviewers pointed emphatically to the Faust dramas of both Goethe and Marlowe as sources for his work, he exclaimed in his own unique fashion, "The Devil may take both Faustuses, German and English, I have taken neither!"

Comparing the work of Byron with that of Goethe would indeed be much like comparing a part with the whole. The point of contact, as Byron indicated, is only in the beginning, after which in *Manfred* the end is rash and sudden. But in *Faust* the real problem has then only been stated and begun. Its ultimate solution is worked out later in the *Second Part*. Incidentally it might here be observed that these two selections also give a fair representation of the life and activity of the two authors. *Manfred*, like Byron, is tuned to a very high pitch, is short in duration, dramatic, sensational, and tragic. *Faust*, the most polished and mature work of Goethe, being the first to engage the youthful student and the last to be finished by the declining octogenarian, on the other hand, is long, represents a complete lifetime in its hero, and although it starts out very turbulent and defiant, proceeds through the vicissitudes of life to a "clearness" and harmony in old age that are meant to offer a real adjustment for the conflict, which in *Manfred* is little more than stated under hopeless conditions that necessitate skepticism and tragedy, while *Faust* ends victoriously in optimism.

The friendly and mutually helpful relation between these two poets extended apparently unbroken during the entire period of their acquaintance, or rather, of their knowledge of each other, from 1816 to Byron's death in 1824. Byron showed his growing admiration in the fact that in 1821 he dedicated his *Sardanapolis* to his great German contemporary in terms which reflect honor on both poets alike. Meanwhile Goethe further expressed his admiration for Byron in his review of the first cantos of *Don Juan*. After prefacing his remarks with a German translation of the opening stanzas he says: "*Don Juan* is an immensely original and powerful work; misanthropical to the bitterest savageness, tender to the depth of sweetest love; and as we have come to understand and appreciate the author,—(nor do we wish him other than he is) we gratefully enjoy what he ventures to bring before us with such unbounded audacity, nay, with such utter recklessness. The technical treatment of the verse, too, is quite in accordance with the strange, wild, relentless contents. The poet spares the language as little as the character; and when we examine his work more closely we find that English poetry is in possession of what German poetry has never yet attained: a classically elegant comic style."

Whether this review ever reached Byron is unknown; it is barely possible. Nevertheless in 1822 he again dedicated his new drama, *Werner*, "to the illustrious Goethe by one of his humblest admirers."

Goethe, especially in his later years, was very reluctant to impose his intimacy upon strangers, but he had nevertheless sent words of heartiest greeting and kindly inquiry to Byron in response to a similar message conveyed through a Mr. Sterling. But when this second dedication reached him he communicated at once directly to Byron his feelings expressed in a short poem. Roughly translated it runs as follows:

"Friendly greetings come in rapid succession
From the South, bringing happy hours.
They summon us to follow noble thoughts,
Free is the soul, though fettered is the foot."

How shall I, who long have traced his brilliant course,
Say to him words of endearment from afar?
To him who is at variance with himself,
Long wont to bear the deepest woes.

May he be happy when he feels himself again!
 And even dare to call himself thrice blest,
 When his loved muse has banished grief,
 And as I know him, may he know himself!"

Fortunately, although owing to a misfortune, these lines with a hearty invitation to come to Weimar still reached Byron. He had already started for Greece, but by an unfavorable wind was driven back to Leghorn, where he found this message awaiting him. Hastily he writes his short but touching reply:

"Illustrious Sir,—I cannot thank as you ought to be thanked for the lines which my young friend, Mr. Sterling, sent me of yours; and it would but ill become me to pretend to exchange verses with him who, for fifty years, has been the undisputed sovereign of European literature. You must, therefore, accept my most sincere acknowledgements in prose—and in hasty prose, too;" and after explaining the delay in his journey, he concludes:

"Here also I found your lines and Mr. Sterling's letter; and I could not have had a more favorable omen, a more agreeable surprise, than a word of Goethe, written by his own hand. I am returning to Greece, to see if I can be of any little use there. If ever I come back I will pay a visit to Weimar, to offer the sincere homage of one of the many millions of your admirers.

"I have the honor to be, ever and most, your obliged,

"NOEL BYRON."

This letter marks the end of Byron's personal relations to Goethe; indeed a very fitting and dramatic conclusion, which Goethe, as he himself says, "preserved among his most precious documents as the worthiest testimony of a worthy connection."

One more work of Byron's, though considerably belated, received a public review by Goethe in his *Kunst und Alterthum*, viz: *Cain*. This review is perhaps more exclusively laudatory than any other that he had written. In part, he says: "It excited in me feelings of astonishment and admiration; an effect which all that is good, beautiful, and great must produce in an unprejudiced, receptive mind."

Two months after the date of this publication, April 19, 1824, occurred the death of Byron, but it was not until May 23, that the news reached Goethe. In his journal for that day he

does little more than record the bare fact, but his reticent mood for several days, no doubt, indicated more clearly than written words the deep loss he felt in the untimely death of his favorite poet, who, as he later very casually remarked, was the only living poet whom he considered his peer. Byron, too, even in more modest terms, had said that Goethe was the only living poet whom he considered his superior.

Goethe's attitude toward the young Lord was much like that of a farsighted and kindly father, who saw all the good that was in him and sought to bring it out, without any trace, whatsoever, of the condescending or patronizing, and without inflicting any insult or unwise censure upon the highly gifted but wayward youth.

During the eight years of Goethe's life after the death of Byron, we find many references to the English poet in Goethe's conversations, especially in those with his secretary, Eckermann. And in every instance Goethe speaks in terms of highest regard and profound respect for Byron, both as a poet and as a man. His general estimate of Byron, however, was soon condensed into a memorial paper, at the request of Medwin, who wished to get all available material for his *Conversations with Byron*. This article Goethe entitled: *Lebensverhaeltnisse zu Byron*. In it we have an eloquent summary of all that this poet, both personally and in his writings, had meant for Goethe. Only an excerpt from the last page can here be given: "We were warranted in hoping that when his great deeds should have been achieved, we might personally have greeted in him the pre-eminent intellect, the happily acquired friend, and the most humane of victors. But now we are comforted in the conviction that his countrymen will at last recover from that violence of invective and reproach which has been so long raised against him, and will learn to understand that the husks and the dross of the age and of the individual, through which even the best have to work their way to freedom, are but perishable and transient,—while the extraordinary fame to which he has exalted his country in the present and for the future, is as boundless in its glory as it is incalculable in its results. Surely

cond.

that nation which may boast of so many great names, will place him in transfigured form among those on whom its own honor will always depend."

But the greatest and, in the world of letters, the most beautiful tribute to Byron, Goethe has given us in the third act of the *Second Part of Faust*. Here in the unique character of Euphorion, the son of the Anglo-Saxon Faust and the Grecian Helen, he immortalized the equally unique English poet. To Eckermann, July 1827, he explains the reasons for his choice of poets. "As a representative of the most recent period of poetry I could make use of no one except him, who, without doubt, must be considered the greatest talent of the century. And besides, Byron is neither antique nor romantic, but he is like the present day itself. That was the kind of man I required and he furthermore fitted in with my views on account of his discontented spirit and his warlike tendency, by which he perished at Missolonghi."

In the drama this Euphorion makes a bold and daring flight over the turbulent waters. But suddenly he falls and in despair calls out from the deep:

"Leave me here, in the gloomy void,
Mother, not thus alone—"

To this the chorus responds with the famous dirge, whose first stanza runs as follows:

"Not alone! where'er thou bidest,
For we know thee, what thou art,
Ah! if from the day thou hidest,
Still to thee will cling each heart.
Scarce we venture to lament thee,
Singing envious of thy fate;
For in storm and sun were lent thee
Song and courage, fair and great."

In order to understand more fully the real significance of the unique relation between these two poets it might be well, in conclusion, to compare, at least in a general way, their personal characteristics and their literary messages.

Both poets are essentially subjective and lyric in their poetic expression; both were in inspiring and vitalizing touch with

nature; both had an unquenchable hatred for all forms of sham, hypocrisy and cant; both believed in the living out of all that is in man according to the principles of his own nature. For both the *individual* stands in the center of the worlds they create; around him everything revolves and moves; from him emanates all that is vital and potent in their poetry; his freedom and development is the first object in their creation. But here the parallel stops, for here is the place where Byron, at least in the large body of his poetry, stops.

In his own personal career, to be sure, he went far beyond this, and literally lost himself in a great cause,—not so his typical heroes. These he selects from among those who by nature are privileged with charming beauty, unbending strength, and an exuberant individuality. They stand on their own strength and defy every opposing force, good or evil; they bow to neither. They are Faust but without a compact, and like him, they aspire to power and happiness, and both alike escape them continually. They are free, desperately free, but little more. They have no kindred, hold no communion with the world around them, and regard the crowd with disdain. Like Manfred and Cain, they have within them the mysterious germ of discontent. And whether they, like Faust, delve into the infinite, and like disembodied spirits, soak through the broken bounds of time and space, or like the Corsair and the Giaour, sweep over the wide expanse of the ocean; they are all alike hounded and haunted by a secret anguish and dread from within, which is not satisfied with mere liberty. Gifted with a freedom and a power they know not how to use, they stand alone. As Cain himself laments, "they thirst for good," but they cannot achieve it. They have no mission, no purpose, no comprehension of humanity as a unit. They stand detached from the past, as from the future. They plunge and live through their restless and convulsive existence, and in the end, die as they lived, alone and unwept.

Goethe, on the other hand, had a constructive program of life which he transmitted and transfigured in his poetry. His typical heroes, too, are taken from the ranks of the full-blooded mortals, who usually tower far above the common lot. They, too, resent the barriers of the finite mind and defy alike trad-

ition and convention. But this is only the wild beginning, and not the end of their existence. Faust, to be sure, is tortured with the pangs of conscience, and haunted by the anguish of despair; still he, too, never sheds a single tear of repentance, nor offers a single prayer to appease an angry God. But in the long years of constant struggle he does gain an interest, even a passion, for the common good of mankind. Life for him assumes an end and purpose beyond the mere individual. He uses freedom, power, and authority to rule a vast domain which his skill and ingenuity have wrested from the sea, and offers livelihood and a living for a million human souls. Not until he has come to this achievement can he say to the moment: "Tarry, thou art so fair," and after the successful struggle of a hundred years, he departs this life in peace, while his soul is wafted to the skies.

Changing Concepts of Liberty in England

CULVER H. SMITH

Trinity College

Nothing has proved more elusive than liberty, and its endless pursuit has filled the pages of English history. Men thought, and still think, it was achieved by Magna Carta, but it had to be fought for again in the fourteenth century, in the Great Civil War, and in the Revolution of 1688. Glorious as it seemed to the Whigs, even that vindication of liberty failed to satisfy men for long; reform bills in the nineteenth century were one after another hailed as heralds of a newer freedom. Nor is this peculiar to England. The thirteen American colonies fought a war of independence to achieve their liberty; they won, but three-quarters of a century later they were fighting a sterner civil war for liberty, and the latest generation of free-born American citizens carried into office and power in 1912 a president whose banner bore the strange device, "The New Freedom." "What we and our Allies are fighting for," said Sir Edward Grey in April 1917, "is a free Europe, free not only from the domination of one nationality by another, but free from hectoring diplomacy and the peril of war." Great Britain was fighting for the liberty to be supreme upon the seas. Masters and men all over the world are fighting for liberty, masters for liberty to employ their capital as they see fit, men for liberty to choose their own conditions of labor. Like charity, liberty covers a multitude of sins.

It is the penalty of general and inspiring concepts that they mean many different things and inspire different minds in many different ways. Parliament in its Grand Remonstrance in 1641 declared that the abolition of the Star Chamber and High Commission had most effectually secured men in their "persons, liberties, and estates." King Charles, on the other hand, in his impeachment of the Parliamentary leaders charged them with endeavoring to set up an arbitrary power over the "lives, liberties, and estates of his Majesty's people." And finally, Cromwell could find no more fitting indictment of the Rump Parliament, after he had turned it out of doors, than the fear that

through its inefficiency the "lives, liberties, and comforts of God's people" would be delivered into the hands of their enemies.¹ Charles I fought for liberty no less than did the Parliament or the army. In the French Revolution of 1848 the socialists, bourgeois radicals, moderate republicans, and Catholics all interpreted "liberty" and "equality" after the desires of their own hearts. Both North and South fought for liberty in the American Civil War, the North for the liberty of the negroes in the South, the South for liberty to manage its own affairs. There is no end to the paradoxes for which liberty has been the excuse or the justification. The crimes perpetrated in its name have been as multifarious as the sins committed in behalf of religion, or the battles fought for the sake of peace.

The conception of liberty depends upon whose conception it is. "Free monarchy" to Bacon and King James was an absolute monarchy, so that a "free monarchy" is incompatible with what we call free government. To the English middle class of the Industrial Revolution liberty meant freedom from mercantile restraints and from the special privileges of the land-owning aristocracy, in other words, freedom to establish complete *laissez-faire*. The liberties of corporations, classes, or individuals mean special privileges for them, and this involves considerable interference with the liberty of the non-privileged. "Freedom of contract" may result in a practical bondage of one of the parties to the other. "A free church," says Professor Ritchie, "may allow less liberty of thought than churches that are not liberated from the state."²

The problem of liberty, like that of property, is one of distribution. To say that men have achieved liberty is an inaccurate way of stating that some men have achieved some liberty. Liberty cannot be divorced from equality. There was sense and logic in the union of the trinity of the French Revolution; there can be no liberty without some equality. But the third of the trio, fraternity, supplies—to an American undergraduate at least—the best illustration of the difficulty we have to face in tracing the growth of liberty. Every American college stu-

¹ Dunning, W. A., *Political Theories, Luther to Montesquieu*, p. 223.

² Ritchie, D. G., *Natural Rights*, p. 138.

dent knows what a fraternity is; it is a voluntary association of students for social—some think for anti-social—purposes. Like every association, its value consists quite as much in the many undesirable persons it excludes as in the select few it comprehends. In this country fraternities are, indeed, too select for ultra-democratic feeling, and in more than one legislature bills have been introduced to abolish them as contraventions of the democratic principle. Now if a measure were passed by congress guaranteeing to all fraternities in perpetuity their privileges and their property it is easily conceivable that such a measure might come to be called the great charter of fraternities. But it is not less easy to understand that the excluded majority might fail to discern any connection between such a measure and the democratic ideal of fraternity.

The above illustration is indicative of the nature of Magna Carta. It is the great charter of liberties, but not of liberty, and few habits are more fatal to historical understanding than that of assuming that the same word has the same meaning at different periods. Magna Carta is a grant to "all freemen" of the kingdom. But if we ask of whom do the "freemen" consist, we are bound to say the feudal lords—the land-owning nobility—for no villein was a *liber homo*, or free man. The expansion of a nation's mind is seen, like that of a child's, in the expansion of the meaning of the terms it uses. One child has been known to think that Eleanor of Aquitaine was corrupt because she was described in a text-book as "one of Henry II's stoutest adherents;" another imbibed the same idea of God from being told of His omnipresence. Both liberty and religion were very local to primitive minds. Medieval liberties were always attached to particular persons or places; there was nothing general or national about them. They were definite, concrete privileges which some people enjoyed but most did not. The first clause of Magna Carta, *quod ecclesia anglicana libera sit*, seems to be general enough, but the explanation which follows shows that all it meant was that cathedral chapters should be free to select their bishops, and presumably that the king should not be free to refuse them their temporalities.

The liberty of a baron consisted in his authority over others in the court he held, and in the prerequisites of his jurisdiction. To deprive him of this jurisdiction over his villeins was an infringement of liberty forbidden by the thirty-fourth clause of the Charter. Another infringement of liberty forbidden by the Charter was the reduction of the number of villeins on the estates of the wards of the crown. That was a "waste of men" which impaired the value of the lands, and the emancipation of his villeins infringed the liberty of the lord. Just as one man's food is another man's poison, one man's liberty is another's servitude. The liberties which the barons hoped to secure at Runnymede were largely composed of the services of their villeins. A liberty was in no sense a common right or a popular conception. Medieval liberties were numerous, but their recipients were few. It was because they were rare privileges and not common rights that the framers of Magna Carta set so much store by them.

It was the gradual sapping of the power of the barons by the strong Norman kings that precipitated the struggle culminating at Runnymede. Magna Carta was an effort of the barons to maintain their power and their liberties. Although it has been called the keystone of English liberty, Magna Carta should not be regarded as the first enunciation of definite guarantees of liberty. In itself the Charter was no novelty, nor did it claim to establish any new constitutional principles. The Charter of Henry I, granted at his coronation in 1101, formed the basis of the whole, and, like the Petition of Right and Bill of Rights of the seventeenth century, Magna Carta professed to assert rights and liberties which were already old, sought to redress grievances which for the most part were innovations upon the ancient liberties of the people. The conception of liberty developed as the English constitution developed, and, like the constitution, it was based largely on custom and precedent, changing only as new problems were met and solved.

The power and liberties of the barons were not broken until the Tudor period. Prior to this period lordship and liberty were much the same thing. Peers raised armed forces and made proclamations much like the king. The idea of a single all-embracing national sovereign was still in the making, and

lords still regarded themselves as princes enjoying sovereign liberties. The destruction of these liberties was the great service rendered by the Tudors to the cause of English liberty. In the middle ages liberty was a local matter; Parliament had failed to nationalize it. With the help of the crown that nationalization was achieved in the sixteenth century. Liberty was made more common by redistribution; the great liberties of the few were diminished, the meagre liberties of the mass increased. This liberation was achieved, like most acts of emancipation, by despotic means. Henry VII restrained the liberty of maintenance and deprived the nobles of their hosts of armed retainers. By means of the Star Chamber he checked their liberty of packing, bribing, and intimidating juries. Henry VIII, by an act of parliament, took many medieval "Liberties" into his own hands; he improved upon the petition presented by the commons in 1348, and he not only refrained from granting liberties, to the hindrance of the common law and the oppression of the common people, but revoked the grants that had been made. By centralizing power the Tudors expanded English liberties and converted local privileges into common national rights.

This transmutation was accomplished by means of Parliament and could not have been accomplished without it. This is true for two reasons: first, the common feeling produced by the coöperation of local representatives at Westminster prepared the way for the requisite surrender of local prejudice, and, second, nothing less than an act of the crown in Parliament could have constrained these local and personal liberties. It was a revolutionary process to override a medieval liberty, for the notion of fundamental law was deeply ingrained in the medieval mind, and the possessors of liberties based their possession on a divine or natural law that was beyond and above the power of kings and parliaments. The growth of positive law at the expense of divine and natural law, and the idea that human will could amend the foundations of society, is the beginning of the sovereignty of Parliament. Parliament only succeeded in overriding the individual because every Englishman was "intended" to be present in Parliament, and an act of Parliament was understood to be by representation the act of every

individual. Its sovereignty was the sum total of the will of the community. It monopolized legislative power and prepared the way for the Austinian dogma that law is the command of the state. Liberty, therefore, came to depend, not upon an immutable divine or natural law, but upon the will of the community as expressed in the acts of Parliament, which could extend, restrict, or redistribute the various liberties possessed by different classes.

With the coming of the Stuart kings there arose a diversity of concepts. England had been united under the aegis of the High Court of Parliament. There were no local sovereignties, no provincial parliaments, no autonomous church. But, within the precincts of this court, crown, lords, judges, and commons contended for the mastery and asserted their liberties in a mediæval spirit. James I and Charles I were just as intent upon "liberty" as the House of Commons or Chief Justice Coke, and to each element in the court liberty meant its liberty, that is to say, its independence and irresponsibility. James was enamored of a law of "free monarchy," and he tried to impress it upon his people. By this freedom he meant independence alike of Pope and Parliament, and dependence only on God. Like true mediævalists, the Stuarts based their claim to rule upon a divine, immutable right, but they added a reformation doctrine, that this right was immune from papal arbitrament, and a further contention that it was based upon primogeniture. With this right parliaments had nothing to do.

But on the other hand Parliament's conception of liberty was hardly less self-centered. Liberty was its liberties. Parliament was convinced that its liberties were immemorial, that they were irrevocable rights independent of the grace and favor of the Crown. Parliament was, it told James in 1604, above the law; it regarded itself as neither responsible to the Crown nor to the people. Chief Justice Coke, on the other hand, was concerned with the liberties of the judges; according to him they were independent and irresponsible. To him the autocracy of the bench was the highest kind of liberty. Nor were these conceptions radically different from that of Cromwell. In his view the army's title to rule was a divine right proved by victories vouchsafed by the God of battles.

The cause of the Commonwealth was advocated by John Milton. He expressed the theory of natural rights, the theory of contract and the consequent right of revolt. The royalist claim that the election of a king expresses the choice of God is turned against its makers; if the people's act in election is the action of God and a just ground for enthroning a monarch, why is not the people's act in rejection equally the act of God and a just ground for deposing? If it is by God that kings reign, it is by God, too, that people assert their liberty. Milton's concept of liberty was that liberty was the birthright of men and nations, the assurance to the individual of a wide sphere of action unrestricted by any government. It is really the foundation of nineteenth century *laissez-faire*.

This individualization of natural rights is discernible in the many manifestos of the Levellers, and the thought of these men marks a conspicuous stage in the transition from the ancient notions of the rights of the people to the modern notions of the rights of man. According to the instrument drafted by the Independents, called "The Agreement of the People," liberty included the right of the people to resist the government. Had this famous document been put into operation, it would have been recognition of an authority, capable of self-expression, higher than the ordinary legislature; it would have stood as the express will, not of Parliament, but of the people considered as individuals.

Hobbes' concept of liberty is in sharp contrast to that of Milton and the Levellers. Liberty was whatever the sovereign, that is, the law of the land, has not forbidden and what cannot, by the nature of the original pact, be given up. It was not to be understood that the liberty of the subject was in any sense a limitation upon the power of the sovereign. The power of the sovereign to take away the life or the property of the subject was not affected by the fact that such power had not been announced in any formal law. In short, the liberties of the subject could properly be thought of only in relation to the laws of the commonwealth. Hobbes made a distinction between natural right and natural law. Natural right signifies simply the liberty possessed by every man of doing what seems best for the preservation of his existence; natural law implies

primarily restraint rather than liberty. His was a theory based on the experience of the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth and used to defend Cromwell, for Cromwell was exercising power on the same theory as the Tudors.

While in some respects the political theories of Hobbes and Locke are similar, as regards liberty they differed. Locke defined it as exemption, not from every rule save the individual's arbitrary caprice, but from every rule save the law of nature. This law is conceived not as a limitation upon human freedom, but as an essential concomitant of it. Locke's state of nature, like Milton's, means nothing more than the relation that exists among men who have no common political superior. His theory was conceived to support the rebellion against James II. Locke's theories found fruitful soil in America; the Fathers of the American Revolution were supplied both with historical precedents and with philosophical formulae from the England of the seventeenth century.

The constitutional struggle of the seventeenth century was an effort to deprive the kings of their liberties, and it was consummated in the Revolution of 1688. Liberty was transferred from the King to Parliament, and Parliament could authorize the King to commit every one of the acts which before it had declared illegal without its consent. No bounds were imposed upon the freedom of Parliament, and for three-quarters of a century after the Revolution the House of Commons asserted an independence and irresponsibility as great as that which the Stuarts had claimed for themselves. Parliament's privilege was, in fact, the last of medieval liberties to be reduced to common law.

The Whigs boasted much of the "civil and religious liberty" which they thought they had won by the glorious Revolution. Yet it is clear that such liberty did not imply to them a universal franchise, a share of every man in the control of the government. Not one Englishman in fifty possessed a vote in the eighteenth century; for a hundred years and more after the Revolution the Whigs as a whole opposed any extension of the franchise. The Whig concept of liberty was not very different from that of Charles I; government was not a matter pertaining to the people; for the vast majority liberty should

consist in freedom from molestation, the kind of liberty which every benevolent despot of the eighteenth century tried to bestow on his subjects. Liberty of conscience they conceded, and some liberty of speech and worship, but the Test Acts still remained upon the statute-book, freedom of the press was still restricted, and that kind of liberty which implies a right to vote was ignored. This last was not till 1918 admitted as an indispensable element of freedom, for the whole population was supposed to be free, while only one sex wielded the vote. Parliament thought that liberty was achieved in 1688 when its houses controlled the crown. Their liberties were no doubt secured, but the Whigs failed to realize that unless the nation secured control of parliament, parliamentary liberties might become as dangerous to the community as the baronial liberties of 1215, or the royal liberties of the Stuarts.

The attitude of Parliament was upheld by the published theories of Montesquieu, De Lolme, and Blackstone. Thus De Lolme says, "To live in a state where the laws are equal for all and sure to be executed, (whatever be the means by which these advantages are obtained), is to be free."³ Thus conceived, individual liberty is not assured by the privilege of voting on a project of law, or indeed, on the choice of a representative. Blackstone thought that perfect liberty was compatible with the "irresistible, absolute, uncontrolled authority of the sovereign," and that sovereign to him was Parliament. His definition of civil liberty is "natural liberty so far restrained by human laws (and no farther) as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public."⁴

In their admiration for the English government many popular writers have fallen into the error of confounding the struggle for parliamentary supremacy with the struggle for democracy. Nothing could be more misleading. The "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 was a *coup d'état* engineered by the upper classes, and the liberty it preserved was the liberty of nobles, squires, and merchants—not the political liberty of the common people. The House of Commons was essentially undemocratic. Only one man in ten had even the nominal right to vote. It is

³ Dunning, W. A., *Political Theories, Rousseau to Spencer*, p. 77.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

estimated that from 1760 to 1832 nearly one-half of the members owed their seats to patrons, and the representatives of large towns were frequently chosen by a handful of rich merchants.

But with the development of the Industrial Revolution there was introduced into Parliament a new element—the industrial capitalist. This new element was largely responsible for the theory that has stamped this period of English history. This was the period of “natural rights” and “economic individualism.” In France Turgot and the other advocates of the new “political economy” cried *laissez-faire!* And in 1776 Adam Smith published his learned treatise on the *Wealth of Nations* in which he held that commerce and industry should be largely free of restrictions and taxes. Liberty to him meant business unhampered by laws or restrictions. The liberty of the French Revolution was applied to economics. According to the political economists of the time, each man should be concerned only with his own gain and should let others shift for themselves. “Private interest,” it was said, “is the great source of public good.”

The application of the new theories of individualism and liberty demanded three things: (1) the abolition of all guilds and chartered companies and monopolies which might obstruct free competition, (2) the abolition of all governmental restrictions on industry, and (3) the prohibition of workingmen's unions. Each individual workingman should be allowed to make his own bargain or “free contract” with his employer. It was rank tyranny, said the champion of industrial liberty, to interfere with any workingman's sacred right freely to sell his labor as he pleased. The demands of economic “liberty” were achieved in most countries in the nineteenth century, as the influence of the industrial capitalists became strong in politics. In Great Britain during the first thirty or forty years of the century, industry and commerce were rendered almost entirely free of restriction. Industrial liberty became the order of the day in every industrial state.

It was expected that with the achievement of liberty happiness and prosperity would be attained. And truly Great Britain, whose industry was most completely emancipated,

grew very wealthy; her capitalists were more prosperous, and her factories and ships more numerous than was the case with any other nation. The fruits of liberty seemed to be as precious as the golden apples of ancient fable. Yet along with the golden apples the tree of liberty brought forth bitter and unsightly fruit for the workers. The early factories were ugly, ill ventilated, poorly lighted, and unsanitary, and the buildings were hastily and cheaply built. In these dingy buildings, choked with dust and worn with overwork, the English freeman enjoyed to the utmost the blessed privilege of the freedom of contract.

While Malthus was suggesting, if not proving, that the forlorn conditions of the working man were permanent and inevitable; while Ricardo was proving, to his own astisfaction, that the dominant right of the land-owner and the capitalist in the products of industry was imbedded in the very nature of created things; while John Stuart Mill was coldly formulating the rule of economic existence, summed up in pitiless competition, with the wall always for the weaker, Robert Owen was turning attention to the effects of these theories and laying the foundation for the new theory of socialism. In France Fourier and Saint-Simon were the exponents of the new order. Their aim was personal liberty—the control of capital. Owen and his followers preached for half a century the re-ordering of society so as to render impossible the poverty and wretchedness of the wage-earning classes. Between 1820 and 1840 the Owenites were an important element in the forces that brought about reform legislation to improve the general situation. The laws that prohibited trade unions were repealed in 1825, and in 1833 the first regulation of factories in the interest of the laborers was embodied in the statutes. The industrial classes began to insist with dangerous vigor on a reform of Parliament that would give them some share of the power exercised by it. The rise of socialism had brought a new view of the rights of property. It called for liberty of the factory from poverty and wretchedness.

The nineteenth century brought a need for a new kind of liberty. Industrial liberty is the product of a new age, an age of industry with problems peculiar to such an age. In 1874, British Liberalism, after forty-four years of almost uninter-

rupted power, lost control of British policy, and lost it largely because its concept of liberty was inadequate for the solution of the current political problems. In 1890 the Trade Union Congress passed a series of resolutions stating the demands of organized labor, and henceforth Liberalism had to compete with a class-conscious Labor Party in applying the principle of liberty to a condition of economic inequality which was now widely thought of as due to human action in the past and as modifiable by human action in the future. The Liberal Government of 1892 to 1895 was shorter lived than that of 1880 to 1885 because of its inability to construct an intelligible social or Irish policy based on the principle of liberty. Gladstone, for the quarter of a century from 1868 to 1893, was himself the Liberal Party and drove his party with unsurpassed powers of personal work and leadership. Liberty to Gladstone was always the "great and precious gift of God" without which "human excellence cannot grow up in a nation." But to the end of his life Gladstone failed to understand the psychological processes involved in the more complex problems of liberty.

Political theory during the nineteenth century was devoted largely to the task of adjusting the conceptions of authority and liberty so as to escape the dilemma of the anarchists. Nature was dropped out of consideration as God had been before, and other concepts were brought forward as fetters for the individual will. Reason, righteousness, history, especially as embodied in constitutional formulas, were variously adduced as the source of authority and the limits of liberty. The nation, a political organism independent of control by the individual, was set up as the source of control over him. Finally, society, as an entity comprehending the whole range of human relationships, was declared to be the holder and distributor of authority over all.⁵

And so the problem of liberty remains unsolved. At the Revolution of 1688 men imagined that all was gained with the achievement of civil and religious liberty; in the nineteenth century they pinned their faith to political liberty and looked for the millenium with the ballot. In the twentieth, men are

⁵ Dunning, W. A., *Political Theories, Rousseau to Spencer*, p. 422.

still seeking for a new freedom, for a fresh liberty, which some would call moral and some economic. The ceaseless struggle for liberty has therefore taken an economic turn. The liberties of Magna Carta implied the servitude of villeins; the enfranchisement of villeins portends the "servile state." For the liberties of masters we have the liberties of men, and for the subordination of the many the restriction of the few. The rise of democracy, like every struggle for liberty, ended by becoming a struggle for supremacy. But it did not solve the problem of liberty. Even democrats feel that freedom is not identical with the rule of the majority, and syndicalism is a reversion to medieval liberty in that it is an attempt to substitute group control for state control.

O. Henry—A Contemporary Classic*

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON
University of North Carolina

There used to be prevalent a solemn and silly idea to the effect that it was not possible to disengage the classic from the contemporary. It is clearly erroneous to identify unthinkingly the contemporary with the ephemeral. A certain residuum of contemporary literature will surely survive for considerable intervals of time of varying length; a smaller proportion will be incorporated in the text-books of the future; a smaller proportion still will go on the shelves with the "classics"—and thus belong with the fixed stars of the literary firmament. What an enjoying diversion to scan the literary firmament—visible to the naked eye! How easy to distinguish those larger luminaries which by reason of size and brightness we know will be shining steadily in some remote age! Who would hesitate, for an era, to choose Hardy, Meredith, James, Tolstoy and France, in fiction; Ibsen, Rostand, and Shaw in drama; Kipling, Hardy, Meredith in poetry; Brunetière and Brandes in criticism; Kipling and O. Henry in the short-story? When it comes to the lesser luminaries, of lower power, the task of the critical astronomer becomes more exacting, since he has to designate from a much greater number those smaller stars predestined to shine steadily on for a long period with undiminished lustre. Shall we choose between Conrad and Bourget, Galsworthy and Wells, Hamsun and Ibanez? Except as marking turning-points in the history of literature, either for the world or only for a particular country, what chance of "immortality" (say!) have Maeterlinck or Pinero, Moore or Garland, Hauptmann or Strindberg, Rolland or Barbusse? Certainly the critical star-gazer has no difficulty in recognizing the tenuity and low-voltage of the Whartons and Sinclairs, the Bennetts and the Tarkingtons, the Brieux and the Björnsons, the Athertons and the Caines. Did "success" and "permanence" ever before in the history of literature find such ironic

* *Selected Stories from O. Henry*. Edited by C. Alphonso Smith. Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1922.
Letter to Lithopolis. Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1922.

contrasts as in Mary Roberts Rhinehart, Harold Bell Wright, Sinclair Lewis and Edith M. Hull!

It is easy to see that O. Henry is a "contemporary classic." One good reason is because I say so. Other good reasons are because other good critics, scattered all about, say so. Still another reason is that his publishers, despite their natural objection to singling out certain stories as "best stories" and so cutting in on the "general works," have finally decided that they can no longer resist the clamorous demand, voiced now steadily and insistently ever since Will Porter died in 1910, for a single-volume collection of his best short-stories. They appear now under the title of *Selected Stories from O. Henry*—a volume which contains twenty-five stories. The editor, Professor C. Alphonso Smith, head of the Department of English in the United States Naval Academy, concludes his introduction with this sensible observation, which wholly disarms criticism:

The twenty-five stories that follow are arranged chronologically and represent O. Henry's chief regional interests, his favorite themes, his varying technique, his humor and pathos, and the four distinctive stages of his career. That they are the best twenty-five stories that he wrote no two readers would probably agree. With the exception of perhaps six of these stories substitutes equally good but hardly better could probably be found. When it is remembered that the ten lists of O. Henry's best stories resulted in a vote of sixty-two best, it can hardly be expected that my own choice of twenty-five will escape the dissent of the critic. If censure be mingled with dissent, no harm will be done; a closer study of O. Henry's work will be ample recompense for both censor and censured.

It piques our curiosity to hear mention of "perhaps six stories" which cannot be equalled. Which are these six? I am sure I don't know which six Dr. Smith has in mind; but I am certain of the six which, to my mind, are irreplaceable: "Roads of Destiny," "A Retrieved Reformation," "The Furnished Room," "An Unfinished Story," "The Gift of the Magi," and "A Municipal Report." I am not quite sure, after all, but that "The Trimmed Lamp" should replace "A Retrieved Reformation."

The reader is asked to note that, after all, the volume is not entitled "Twenty-five Best Stories of O. Henry," but, quite

simply, "Selected Stories from O. Henry." We suspect that the editor was more concerned with the task of making the collection thoroughly representative than with the task of assaying out the best ten per cent of O. Henry's writing. I say "representative"—by which is meant most effectively expressive, indicative of—well, several things. First, types in literary form: the story with a moral, the story with a meaning, the story merely with a laugh. Second, types in regional setting: New York, the South, the West, foreign lands. I am impressed by the fact that fifteen of the twenty-five stories are located in New York; and that of these stories, seven are chosen from a single volume, *The Four Million*. The other regions represented are: Washington, one; France, one; Arkansas, one; Arizona, one; Montana, one; Texas, one; South America, one; Georgia, one; Tennessee, one; North Carolina, one. Surely the selection is ill-balanced on the regional side; and a greater number of stories with scenes laid in South, West, and Southwest should have been included. From the regional standpoint above, it is indefensible to include only one story from Texas, since forty of O. Henry's stories are located there. Without desiring needlessly to cavil at Dr. Smith's list or ambitiously to supply a list of my own, I would displace "The Brief Debut of Tildy" in favor of "Madame Bo-Peep of the Ranches"—a story thoroughly characteristic of the Southern man's point of view, romantic sweetness, and simplicity; and "Makes the Whole World Kin" is a feeble competitor against "The Memento." No group of twenty-five selected short-stories should omit that masterpiece of human tenderness and sympathy, "Georgia's Ruling;" and no more heart-wrenching brief story was ever written than "A Fog in Santone." And in the name of all that is modern and tragic in the life of tenements, let us enthrone "Brickdust Row" in place of "The Last Leaf." On the side of technique—the third criterion in the selection of these stories—they are much better balanced. I daresay no technical feature peculiar to O. Henry, no important literary desire, fails to appear somewhere in these twenty-five stories. Almost the only excuse for the inclusion of "The Brief Debut of Tildy" is to afford an example, in O. Henry's hands, of the "expanded anecdote," and this excuse vanishes

in face of the inclusion of "A Lickpenny Lover." Another significant feature of this selection is the deliberate omission of any stories from *The Gentle Grafter*. Surely no selection of O. Henry's stories could fully merit the term "representative" which omitted some adventure of the immortal Jeff Peters—a figure as truly American as John Brown, Jesse James, Al Jennings, or Get Rich Quick Wallingford. In the new selection, which each O. Henry fan makes after seeing Professor Smith's choice, I vote to include "Jeff Peters as a Personal Magnet."

O. Henry is fortunate in having so enthusiastic a biographer, so encomiastic an interpreter. With an admiration for O. Henry that is almost unbounded, the editor presents to us only the most nearly impeccable of O. Henry's writings. If this consistent panegyricism gives Professor Smith the air of the special pleader, if O. Henry's gravest faults are gloried over by being ignored and so concealed, no grave damage is done. Delightful as is much of O. Henry's writing, unparalleled as time-killers as are so many of his stories, not even his most ardent admirer would claim for a considerable part of his writing anything more than a brief, hectic life. Written for current "popular" magazines, dashed off frequently under high pressure while the editor with bull-dog tenacity waited the long hours in Porter's own room for the manuscript to be completed, many of these stories deserve to be classified as cheap, trivial, insignificant, ephemeral. After the tumult and shouting have passed, a careful critical commentary would greatly clarify the issues—and help us to assay the output of the Great O. Henry Mine, to separate the dross from the gold.

Meantime, let us acknowledge with fitting gratitude that Professor Smith is O. Henry's best interpreter, if not his acutest critic. In addition to his *O. Henry Biography*, other important essays by Professor Smith on O. Henry have appeared. At my invitation, he delivered a notable address on O. Henry at Raleigh in 1914; an excellent survey of O. Henry's career appeared in the *World's Work*; a recent essay, published by the Martin Hoyt Company, and soon to appear in the Library of Southern Literature, is the astutest interpretation of O. Henry as literary artist which has come from Professor Smith's pen. In his introduction to the volume under review,

he is not at his best. A peculiarity of his technique as a writer is the tendency to string out one tribute after another; and the reading of the first half of this introduction gives the effect of seeing a lot of lantern slides—a series of pictures succeeding each other in rather wearisome succession. It is Professor Smith's way of "reading into the record" all the best things that have been said, anywhere, about O. Henry; and affords us a catalogue of the most favorable opinion regarding O. Henry as an artist. From the purely critical standpoint the method is not wholly to be commended.

The latter half of the Introduction is a concise summary of Porter's life, of the usual type. The really striking and delightful feature of this volume is the series of miniature critical commentaries, preceding the stories themselves. Professor Smith has no superior in the country in range of reading, fertility in allusion, ingenuity in comparison. His style runs to the laconic, the epigrammatic; he favors the brief sentence in which one idea is balanced with another, or one thought is set against another. Nicely discriminatory in the employment of the one right word to express his meaning, he is inclined at times to use a phrase for its effectiveness, without due regard for its appositeness and correctness. In the minute commentary on the very first story, "The Duplicity of Hargraves," he says: "Regional differences, however, never become sectional differences with him, and characterization never passed into caricature." The last part of this sentence is certainly the reverse of the truth; indeed it may be affirmed with good reason, with reference to the entire range of O. Henry's writing, that characterization very often passed into caricature. A just commentary on "Roads of Destiny" is this: "In sheer but impersonal technique O. Henry never surpassed this story"—the story which begins so grippingly with the "stanzated question":

I go to seek on many roads

What is to be.

True heart and strong, with love to light—

Will they not bear me in the fight

To order, shun or wield or mould

My Destiny?

Professor Smith points out that the chief criticism of "A Retrieved Reformation" has been that in spite of the hero's reformation he offers his kit of burglar's tools to a pal instead of destroying them—an incident which won the hearty approbation of Mr. Al. Jennings, Porter's fellow inmate in the Ohio penitentiary. Professor Smith calls attention to the "philosophical overture" to "Squaring the Circle"—what O. Henry termed a "recitative by the chorus"—and points out that these overtures, which appear prefixed to a number of his stories, are the work of the expositor rather than the pure narrator. With the *dénouement* reached and reviewed, they almost compel the reader to "believe that no other was possible." There are many felicities in Professor Smith's commentaries; and I must leave them to the interested reader. Two observations, however, deserve record here; at least I cannot resist the temptation to mention them. Concerning the oft-repeated charge that O. Henry's characters are difficult to identify by name, the editor says: "If the character of the character, his reaction to his environment, what he or she did or said, the distinctive trait of human nature that each illustrated, the obscure motive that each illumined—if these come back, is not the author's art vindicated?" Concerning Katherine Fullerton Gerould's comparison of O. Henry with Maupassant, to the former's discredit, he says: "I do not know for the life of me how the characters in our selected stories would act under the circumstances. Human nature is proverbially incalculable . . . Maupassant's characters can hardly be said to act. They react, and react with such abnormal uniformity that the reader can conjecture not only their reaction to other happenings but their reaction in the story itself before the story has fairly begun."

Another of those small morsels, so dear to the collectors, is found in *Letters to Lithopolis*, issued in a limited edition of three hundred and seventy-seven copies and sold at ten dollars a copy. It is the second of what appears to be a series of such dainty remnants—the first, "O. Henryana," containing a few neglected stories of mediocre interest omitted from the edition of his collected works. O. Henry was not a particularly good letter writer—his playfulness, his smart aleckishness, his punning and funning are amusing enough in a cheap kind of way—

but rather tend to caricature the writer of the short-stories. These letters were written to Miss Mabel Wagnalls, an authoress and a pianist of note—who dwelt “in Lithopolis”—a town “somewhere” in the Middle West, it would seem. The correspondence was started by the lady, who wrote to ask the publisher whether O. Henry was “a man, woman, or wraith;” and the query afforded the city-pent writer to the “flight into the blue” which his Bohemian spirit craved. These letters are merely the idle scribbles of one who enjoyed this sort of purposeless scribbling for the relief it afforded from the enforced writing of his profession. And the experience was a refreshing interlude of a very shallow content, in the life of a distinguished and hard-working writer. The *timbre* of the whole incident may be caught in the inscription which O. Henry wrote in a volume of his stories:

To Miss Mabel Wagnalls—
with pleasant recollections of a certain
little tea party where there were such nice little cakes
and kind hospitality to a timid stranger.

O. HENRY.

Miss Wagnalls speaks with bated breath of “priceless moments,” of “precious letters;” and even if the mood is the pleasant recollection of “nice little tea cakes,” at least the publication of these letters, however trivial and insignificant they are, will place the name of Mabel Wagnalls in O. Henry literature. Who knows but that, some day, some very imaginative critic may ingeniously discover a secret cipher or hidden cryptogram in this otherwise innocuous babble? In her a trifle adulatory “Preface” she murmurs reminiscently of a “great man”—“one of those soaring spirits, whose altitude is measured by the depth of his insight;” and throughout her contribution there is an unbroken gravity which matches oddly with the levity of the letters.

There are funny things in these letters—that was why O. Henry wrote them: to go on a mental lark. Here is his autobiography (of its truth the reader may judge):

Texas cowboy. Lazy. Thought writing stories might be easier than “busting” bronchos. Came to New York one year ago to earn bread, butter, jam, and possibly asparagus that way. Last week loaned an editor \$20.

It will be recalled that Professor Smith in 1918 announced that Porter found his pen-name in the *United States Dispensatory*—the name of the celebrated French pharmacist, Etienne-Ossian Henry. We may note for what it is worth that, in his prize-letter to Miss Wagnalls, he says: "Way down in Louisiana is where my 'Henry' name came from;" and in an interview in the *New York Times*, April 4, 1909, Porter said:

It was during these New Orleans days that I adopted my pen name of O. Henry. I said to a friend: "I'm going to send out some stuff. I don't know if it amounts to much, so I want to get a literary alias. Help me pick out a good one." He suggested that we get a newspaper and pick out a name from the first list of notables that we found in it. In the society columns we found the account of a fashionable ball. "Here we have our notables," said he. We looked down the list and my eye lighted on the name Henry. "That'll do for a last name," said I. "Now for a first name. I want something short. None of your three-syllable names for me." "Why don't you use a plain initial letter, then?" asked my friend. "Good," said I, "O is about the easiest letter written, and O it is." . . . A newspaper once wrote and asked me what the O stands for. I replied, "O stands for Olivier, the French for Oliver." And several of my stories accordingly appeared in that paper under the name Olivier Henry."

If Dr. Smith's theory is correct, why didn't he give the name "Ossian" instead of "Olivier" in reply to the newspaper's query? Was he only "spoofing" Miss Wagnalls and the reporter of the *New York Times*?

There are only eight of these letters; and if you want to be silly for a while, read them—although I warn you they are not worth ten dollars to anyone except a collector of O. Henryana. I think I snickered most unrestrainedly over this description of his "ear for music":

I once was reputed to know something about printed music, but I acquired the distinction by fraud. I gained it by being able to stand at the piano and turn the music exactly at the proper time for a certain young lady, who aggravated the ivory frequently. No one ever found out that she gave me the signal by moving her right ear, a singularly enviable accomplishment that she possessed. I may say that I had an ear for music, but it did not belong to me.

In the preface to one of the letters, Miss Wagnalls says, anent the question of the pen-name once more: "O. Henry had never bothered to devise a name for that 'O.' It stands

there alone, and will stand so for ever, an unwitting symbol of his fame—that enduring circle, the symbol of eternity.” And when she guessed Otto and Oliver (please note!) and Obadiah, he replied: “Not guilty. Why there’s ‘Orlando’ and ‘Oscar’ and ‘Orville’ and ‘Osric’ and heaps more.” I should mention that O. Henry adds to his fame as a poet in this masterpiece:

Mary had a little lamb;
Its fleece was white as snow;
She took it to Pittsburg one day—
And you just ought to see the gol-
darned thing now!

BOOK REVIEWS

TUDOR IDEALS. By Lewis Einstein. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922. pp. xiii, 366.

The reader will regret that Mr. Einstein, as he explains in his preface, found it necessary to restrict to this small volume—"fragmentary and imperfect" he calls it—what he had originally designed as a more complete history of English Sixteenth Century Ideals. The war and the pressure of a diplomatic career are to be blamed for that. But despite its restricted nature and some faults of fragmentariness and lack of plan, the volume before us will be of great service to any one who seeks an understanding of "a period embracing the formative elements in the life of all English-speaking nations."

The effect of that double movement, the Renaissance and the Reformation, on the mental and spiritual life of England is the theme of the work, with the resulting conceptions of the crown and of the individual, the new "ideals of life and thought," and the new realization of the possibilities of "the enrichment of life." It is under these four main divisions that Mr. Einstein has grouped the results of his research. The aspects of each are so many and various that no attempt can be made here to catalogue them. We may note only a few, as for example, that there was in the 16th century, to some extent in England and much more in Scotland, a belief in the social contract theory of government, with the resulting claim that a sovereign who oppressed his subjects might properly be deposed (pp. 82, 181); that the word "gentleman" was coming to be used in its modern sense, Geoffrey Fenton writing that "Whosoever wrongeth in any sort the meanest that is, cannot in any equity merit the name of gentleman" (p. 160); that Humphrey Gilbert conceived and proposed a singularly modern system of education designed to train young men for the national service, the curriculum to embrace "civil government and finances, martial exercises, navigation, and surgery" (p. 166); that, contrary to the common belief that the English race had a natural aptitude for the sea, "until the end of Elizabeth's reign

English backwardness [in seafaring] lagged behind every other country in Western Europe, and was so great as to astonish foreign observers" (p. 287).

The ideals of the Renaissance, we learn, were not warmly welcomed in the conservative English universities, and when the study of the classics was finally taken up, it was with the emphasis on form rather than content. "Instead of the Ancients being the living inspiration they had proved to Erasmus and to More, the classical tongues came to be regarded primarily as suitable instruments for study. The writing of Latin and Greek became goals for academic ingenuity and the classical revelation, instead of spurring men on to fresh inquiry, was distorted into making unwilling schoolboys compose bad Latin verses" (p. 321). It was thus not through classical studies in the universities but through the reading of translations by those of less learning that the spirit of the Renaissance came to England. "Learning ran past the universities to lodge itself in those who with 'small Latin and less Greek' breathed the revelation of the ancient world" (p. 330).

Such quotations give but a faint idea of the scope of the work. Several of them, however, suggest a reflection which is expressed by the author and which often occurs to the reader, namely, the essentially modern character of the period. Much that was medieval still survived, but on the whole life was viewed through modern eyes. "The modern conception of English life dates from Elizabeth" (p. 340).

The book is not without its minor faults. The author takes the rather common but hardly defensible view that Shakespeare conceived of Prospero's island as in the Bermudas—"the still-vex'd Bermoothes." How is this to be reconciled with Ariel's telling Prospero, a few minutes after the storm, that the rest of the king's fleet

"all have met again
And are upon the Mediterranean flote,
Bound sadly home for Naples,
Supposing that they saw the king's ship wreck'd"?

Indeed, from the manifest absurdities into which Gonzalo is made to fall in picturing his ideal commonwealth, we may well

question the soundness of Mr. Einstein's entire comment: "Shakespeare pointed to America as the land of promise, and located in the Bermudas the hope of the New World, the land where there were neither rich nor poor, nor rulers nor ruled" (p. 186).

The volume is excellently printed. The gain in neatness secured by placing all footnotes in the back of the volume is however more than offset by the loss in convenience, especially as the majority of the readers of the book are likely to be of the type to whom citations of authority are important.

JULIUS W. PRATT.

U. S. Naval Academy.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING READING AND LITERATURE IN THE INTERMEDIATE GRADES AND THE HIGH SCHOOL. By Sterling Andrus Leonard, Assistant Professor of English, The University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin High School. Philadelphia. J. B. Lippincott Co., 1922. 460 pp. Illustrated.

The literature of the teaching of English grows by leaps and bounds. A bibliography becomes out of date almost overnight. And this is as it should be, for the subject is a live one. The technique of the English class, the whole methodology of the subject, is very far from being a settled or conventional affair. Innumerable problems require dispassionate discussion in the dry light of experience.

Professor Leonard's book is based on extensive experience in teaching and on wide reading. He seems to be thoroughly familiar with the "literature" of the subject, and indeed has himself contributed much to it.

He has produced a good book, with whose general principles and conclusions we are in accord. That we are not always able to agree with him on minor points will cause no surprise to the reader who ponders upon the complex problems with which a writer on this subject has to deal. Space will permit the mention of only a few of the many points which the reviewer might profitably discuss.

Literature enriches our experience. "The effect of much verse and of many novels and plays is mere arousal of one's emotions about nothing in particular, simply because they have

often been aroused by the same stimulus before—as when the popular novelist or ‘sob-story’ reporter plays on feelings by using commonplace conventional themes. . . . Of course such mere emotional arousal, in the fashion of revival meetings or cheap political speeches, is in a sense experience; in a loose sense every thing is experience.” This depends on who the reader is. Professor Leonard fails to distinguish between the reader who has read much of this sort of literature and one who has not. We do not plead for E. P. Roe or Harold Bell Wright, but we should condemn neither of them outright. They have and have had their audiences who are not capable at the moment of appreciating anything better—who have not outgrown them as Professor Leonard and some of the rest of us have. So too with the condemnation of Mr. Churchill’s method in *The Crisis* (Leonard, p. 26). The passage does not strike us as reprehensible to any great degree. There is of course the impersonal method, “the presentation of concrete sense experience” (note 11); but some readers are not up to that; it would pass over their heads, and we suspect that Mr. Churchill was thoroughly aware of this fact. Notice, by the way, that he pauses only for a single sentence (“Oh friends, we who live in peace,” etc.) and then goes on with the concrete sense experience.

“Scott succeeds in giving us vivid and satisfying real pictures of King Richard’s crusading, in spite of misstatements of fact which dismay certain historians” (p. 31). Obviously the historians forget that not one of them has ever succeeded in recreating reality as Scott did. The misstatements of fact can easily be corrected in a few lines of annotation which should be imparted to the pupils *after* they have experienced the thrills to which they are entitled from the narrative. It is hardly true to say that we care not for accuracy; but we can secure the accurate statements we need at slight expense from an edition provided with proper apparatus.

On the choice of literature for children Leonard says (p. 125): “Where it presents weakness and wrong, the literature we choose must show forth the individual and social results of such actions as they really are—not in a narrow consideration of effect upon one or two persons alone, but so far as

possible in the totality of influence upon the society of which they form a part." It would have been well, perhaps, to point out that this universal application is not always explicit. A human experience may be narrated with considerable closeness and minuteness of detail and still be typical in its larger bearings. Homer never stops to tell us, "This is true in general as well as in particular"; but we perceive none the less that it is so.

Professor Leonard is on the whole, possibly, a little hard on the annotated edition (pp. 212 ff.). Of course there are facts less relevant than others; but who shall decide for us? Surely not a writer like Hayward, whose words are quoted with approval, but who apparently has a curious notion of what biography should be. We believe that a certain number of dates like the date of birth and of death are of fundamental importance, not for their own sakes but because they help us to orient our ideas with reference to when the author came upon the stage and what was his view of the world. We believe that the classics of our literature should be accessible to pupils in rather fully annotated and scholarly editions, so that if a pupil wishes to go the bottom of a question raised by the text, the editor will not fail him, as is so often the case with editions now on the market. We have *not* said that this apparatus should stand between the reader and his story; it should be used after he has made the acquaintance of the text, and his curiosity should be aroused so as to make him wish to read some of the notes. The fundamental prerequisite to the enjoyment of literature is understanding; and the reason that much of our good literature fails with the young of the present day is that it is not well taught and they never come to understand it. What we have said about notes will apply also to some introductions. Many an introduction is better read after the pupil has read the text than before.

The bibliography is in substance fairly satisfactory, but typographically leaves much to be desired. The page is lopsided. Too many details are omitted, e.g. the Christian names of Smiles and Jones, p. 433. The dates of publication should have been added, especially in the case of a magazine number like that on Electric Railway Transportation (p. 434).

We have noted several misprints: p. 24, l. 10 f.b., read percepts; p. 43, l. 10 f.b., read ineradicably; p. 102, l. 12 f.b., read Thanatopsis; p. 120, l. 9 f.b., read Savonarola; p. 136, l. 12 f.b., apparently delete the of at the end of the line; p. 144, l. 12, for or read of; p. 165, l. 6 f.b., there should be a space after over—; p. 181, l. 3, f.b., by all means read shall for will; p. 197, the heading would be more elegant if it read, What Reading to Teach and Where; p. 341, l. 12 f.b., read especially; p. 347, l. 21 f.b., read Whilomville; p. 348, read Louisa Alcott; pp. 340, 361, read William Allen Neilson; p. 437, read Russell Sage.

As a whole, let us repeat, the book is a good one, and a worthy contribution to the discussion of the weightiest problems that confront the teacher of our vernacular literature today.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

THE MCKINLEY AND ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATIONS 1897-1909. By James Ford Rhodes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922. 418 pp.

A thoughtful perusal of this book calls to mind the reflection of Walter Lippman that the news is one thing, the truth something quite different. Undoubtedly Mr. Rhodes gives the historical news relating to a momentous epoch. And the news has weight, for the author was not only well acquainted with many important characters of that epoch; he was also intimately associated with some others. His book therefore is suggestive of a close-up, a portrayal in words of characters that he knew well and a description of events and deeds concerning which he has personal knowledge. Such a book must hold a place in historical literature along with autobiographies and memoirs.

However, of that other important factor, the truth, which we may define as the meaning of historical events derived from a consideration of their relationship to each other, the book is entirely lacking. Mr. Rhodes is an historian of the old school, a narrator of events, an annalist careful and considerate, rather than an interpreter of that stream of causation

which we call civilization. This is a matter of regret, for to no one does American historiography owe a greater debt for accurate and well written history, and every admirer of his work would appreciate keenly an expression from him as to his conception of the social and political implications of this later period of American history concerning which he knows so much through personal contact as well as research.

W. K. B.

BATOUALA. By René Maran. Translated by Adele Szold Seltzer. New York: Thomas Seltzer. 1922. 207 pp.

Jungle life is crude and raw and brutal and *Batouala*, a faithful picture of the jungle, is all three of these. The book, written in Africa by a negro, describes the life of the savage under white domination. It is a series of vivid sketches held together by the story of the chief Batouala and Bissiguingui, his rival for the affections of Yassiguindja, his favorite wife. The book is alive. The characters, white explorers, savages, birds and beasts, move through its pages, now with a quick nervous staccato, now with the slow langorous movement of the torrid belt. The village life, the hunt, native dances and ceremonies, feasting and drinking, superstitions, sickness and death are etched in unforgettable lines. It is of the realistic school, yes, and it does not spare the loathesome or merely vulgar details, but it is more than realistic, it is life in a place where brutality, blood, unrestrained passions are life.

The author, René Maran, was born in Bordeaux. His parents were natives of the French West Indies. After a university education in his native city, he entered the French colonial service. He is stationed in North Central Africa at Fort Archambault, the only negro among eleven French officials. His literary work up to the publication of *Batouala* had attracted no notice and the announcement that he had been awarded the Goncourt Prize for 1921 created a sensation. Maran is deeply conscious of the wrongs of his race under the colonial system and announces in the preface of this novel his intention to treat the question fully in a forthcoming work.

It promises to be a real contribution to the discussion of the negro problem, which is just as serious for France as for the United States, although somewhat different in form.

F. A. G. COWPER.

ABNORMAL BEHAVIOR. An Introduction to the Study of Abnormal and Anti-Social Behavior. By Irving J. Sands, M.D., and Phyllis Blanchard, Ph.D. New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1923. 482 pp.

We hear much more of mental and nervous ailments today than did our ancestors, and probably the percentage of our population afflicted by these maladies and handicaps has somewhat increased. The comparative humanitarianism and relatively greater welfare of modern times are conducive to the survival of many mentally and nervously unfortunate persons who in olden times would have been swept away by a harsh environment of interminable local warfare and miserable parsimony. Medicine and hygiene also prolong the lives of types that once could not have sustained themselves. It is also commonly claimed that the increased mental and social interaction of contemporary environments puts an unprecedented breaking stress on many nervous systems; that modern commercial and industrial communities injure people nervously, whereas peasant communities wore out the backs and muscles of their members.

In face of these tendencies to increase the amount of mental abnormality the psychological and neurological sciences have learned a great deal about pathological mental conditions; cures are achieved that were once impossible; and mental hygiene has a firm standing in public health activities. Of course, this progress needs to continue. Science has much more to learn about mental pitfalls, and the public beyond persons professionally concerned with the treatment of abnormal mental tendencies, ought to know more about the early symptoms of mental illness. Certainly this is true of the probation officer, the social worker, the parent, and the teacher. Teachers of psychology are interested in better texts for classes in abnormal psychology.

It is to such persons that this book will make the greatest appeal. The work is a simple presentation of data concerning such conditions as borderline types of insanity, dementia praecox, epileptic behavior, morbid personality types, drug addiction, suicide, and serious emotional conflicts, especially with reference to their influences on social conduct. A wide range of topics is run into, including definitions of the normal and abnormal in the sphere of the sexual life, what the glands of internal secretion do and cannot do, and the rôles played by certain mental illnesses in educational and industrial maladjustments.

Academic psychologists will differ among themselves concerning some of the theoretical backgrounds of the book, and about some of its nonenclature. However, the matters that most concern the student of behavior derangements will hardly be questioned.

The authors draw upon their experiences in Bellevue Hospital and in other hospitals and clinics for illustrative cases—137 of which are reported in detail. This does not add to the systematic structure of the book, but makes it more useful.

CLARENCE CECIL CHURCH.

University of Chicago.

THE REVOLT AGAINST CIVILIZATION. By Lothrop Stoddard. New York: Scribners, 1922.

When one pauses to contemplate the tremendous physical force of the masses, in comparison to that of the few who think, act and create for the human race, he stands appalled at what may or will happen when the masses, realizing their strength, refuse longer to be led. This condition is discussed in this book in such a manner as to make one reflect on the situation. The suggested solution is two-fold; Improve the strains by breeding. (A serious problem, for the birth rate of the so-called "lower strata" is much higher than the "better classes"). Improve the "middle masses" intellectually and thus prevent Bolshevism controlling them. (A difficult problem since the masses usually love the spectacular). While we do not believe in alarmism we are of the impression that it would

be well for the "middle masses" as well as the "elect" to read this book. Information and common sense may prevent political and economic upheavals which spell race decadence, and the loss of a heritage which is the product of generations of struggle against environment and the under man. The idealistic state toward which the author looks is one in which "No true superior, wherever born, will be denied admission to the highest class; no person, wherever born can stay in a class unless he measures up to specifications."

BERT CUNNINGHAM.

THE IDEALS OF FRANCE. By Charles Cestre. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1922. 325 pp.

This is a collection of six lectures given in 1922 at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., by Charles Cestre, Professor of American Literature and Civilization at the Sorbonne.

In his introductory lecture, "The Temper of France," Professor Cestre discusses some of the characteristics of his fellow-countrymen, claiming for them love of personal liberty, spontaneity and sincerity, fastidiousness and punctiliousness. Mixed reason and enthusiasm he gives as the keynote of modern French idealism. So he cites Descartes as the inspirer of French classicism, Molière as the critic of unreasonableness, Montaigne as the great humanist, Montesquieu as the real founder of sociology, and Rousseau, Proudhon, Hugo and Zola as important reformers. He insists that after her Napoleonic debauch, France learned that war does not pay and settled down to ways of peace which she regretted to have others disturb.

The second lecture treats of the middle ages. "Faith and Chivalry" were the dominant notes of the time. Their epic was the Song of Roland. The Crusades and the building of the cathedrals were their expression. King Louis IX, saint and lawgiver, was their embodiment.

In the other lectures, "The Ideal of Reason," "The Ideal of Progress," "The Ideals of Equality and Solidarity" and "France and Peace," Professor Cestre discusses the great movements of thought and their leaders in France. Human-

ism, the Protestant reformation, classicism, the philosophies of the eighteenth century, the French Revolution and the movements for social justice and peace are treated as a logical evolution.

The lectures are in the main an admirable presentation of the great contribution which France has made and is making to our modern civilization, but they are marred to some extent by the necessity which Professor Cestre, in common with most Frenchmen, seems to feel to argue with the American people the French side of the Franco-German dispute. Most Americans have a very definite idea of that struggle and in 1918 expressed themselves very forcibly on the question of German domination, but they regard that as settled and want now to see the French and the Germans come to an agreement by which they can live together in peace. Then, while emphasizing the influence of France on other countries, Professor Cestre ignores the fact that German militarism gained a great deal of inspiration from that great expansionist, Louis XIV. He is also evidently not aware that the benevolent ideas of the two Napoleons for bringing "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" to all Europe were misunderstood abroad and that the French were considered as dangerous adventurers who must be guarded against with military preparations and coalitions. Again, he minimizes the influence of the French socialists and pacifists on German thought. He forgets that the stream of their ideas, somewhat modified by Karl Marx, had gathered force and volume, and before and during the Great War caused the militarists much trouble to keep under control. By ignoring the existence of a peaceful, progressive republican or socialistic element in Germany, he is able to persuade himself that all Germans are brutal and faithless and incapable of recognizing any argument but that of superior force.

One other criticism. In treating the philosophers and reformers of the eighteenth century, Professor Cestre barely mentions the fact that they found their ideas in germ in certain English writers. He uses considerable space to show how Montesquieu and Rousseau influenced Washington, Jefferson and Thomas Paine, but he has no room to mention Locke, the English philosopher who contributed so much to the French

group and who, according to some authorities, exerted directly on the American revolutionists most of the influence ascribed to Rousseau and Montesquieu.

Aside from these criticisms, we have nothing but praise for this volume, which should be very useful to the general reader who desires to obtain a background of ideas on the progress of thought in France.

F. A. G. COWPER.

SCIENCE AND HUMAN AFFAIRS. By W. C. Curtis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922. 330 pp.

To be appreciated this book must be read, and it is readable by the average citizen. It is the outgrowth of "side-lights" upon the general subject of Biology as taught by the author, but is no wise technical except in the second part. In the first part he has woven the story of an ever shifting science and religion from the earliest appearance of man until he has called forth our present day scientific attitude toward religion in a most fascinating manner.

The second part deals with more or less technical biological laws in which the lay reader may get lost. The third part is an application of biological laws to society, with a special emphasis upon the value of research and the scientific attitude toward all problems.

One rarely finds a book so full of theological, biological, archeological, social and economic data, written from a scientific view point, which is so readable.

BERT CUNNINGHAM.

COMMON-SENSE ETHICS. By C. E. M. Joad. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1921. 207 pp.

MORAL THEORY. By G. C. Field. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1921. 214 pp.

These two little ethical treatises gain in interest by being considered together, for they have enough in common so that their divergences are significant. They both start from the complex realization that a moral theory would be worthless

whose author was without, on the one hand, a sound knowledge of Plato and Aristotle, Kant and John Stuart Mill, and, on the other, a lively sense of his immediate moral context. Thus both books give a first portion to the exposition of traditional theories and a concluding portion to personal opinions and solutions. But the final weight assigned to tradition and to present-day feeling and need is instructively different in the two cases.

Mr. Joad begins with a careful analysis of Mill's argument for Utilitarianism—the example he chooses to represent an ethics of consequences; he then discusses the theory of a moral sense with especial reference to Kant, and finally Plato's doctrine of the good as an objective form. But no sooner has he summed up and weighed these arguments than he turns almost impishly upon his whole historical performance in a section called: "Unreality of Methods Pursued." Here he says: "What I have been engaged upon in this chapter is a kind of mental game: the game of making inconsistent theories consistent: to use a more accurate analogy I have been playing with a kind of mental jigsaw puzzle, in which the component pieces were theories, and of which the object was to fit the pieces into a rounded and complete whole. . . . How much of philosophy in general, and of ethical philosophy in particular, has been an essay on similar lines in the game of manipulating theories. . . . The process is an interesting one, and if successful arrives at a result which is gratifying to the mind. . . . The important thing to notice, however, is that the process is one in which we drift right away from life, and which leads to conclusions that have no bearing on life" (pp. 86, 87). Thus Mr. Joad builds his house only, apparently, to tear it down when he is done. As a substitute for these artificial theories, he advocates a doctrine which in its turn seems to be a composite, if not of wooden pieces, yet of raw substances. It is a doctrine of impulse, and comes in the main from Freud and Jung, Bertrand Russell, and Bernard Shaw. Modern psychology shows us, says Mr. Joad, that the bulk of our conative life is made up of a mass of irrational impulses; some, like the possessive impulse, need to be curbed; others, like the creative and political, need liberation and stimulation. Guild So-

cialism, he says, has been one of the most successful social and political devices for the organization and regulation of the impulsive life. He believes that impulse has a primary metaphysical significance, for it is the human embodiment of the omnipresent life-force asserted by Schopenhauer.

Mr. Joad's discussion of current ethical problems is unquestionably stimulating, but his criticism of past theory is, I think, anachronistic. The classical ethical systems did in their day spring out of living conditions and return to them. For example, Thomas Hardy, admittedly a master-interpreter of human nature, pictures one of his heroines of two generations ago as settling a course of action by reference to Mill's *Utilitarianism*. Apparently the great novelist thought it possible for a charming and unacademic lady to utilize in the stress of circumstance one of the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle. In the second place, Mr. Joad himself is proof of the fact that the ethical classics have in some degree perennial applicability. For in correcting the half-childish epigram of Oscar Wilde—that "the only way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it"—he turns to Aristotle and Plato for the principles by which correction must be made.

Mr. Field, like Mr. Joad, begins by paying his respects to the philosophical fathers. With skilful dialectic he follows Kant's argument for universality as the test of the rightness and wrongness of an act, and Aristotle's argument for the harmonious development of all the desires. But when he enters upon his own contribution to ethical theory, his attitude is not that of one who condemns past futility, but of one who stands on other men's shoulders. Indeed he says in so many words that the germ of his own conception of the moral ideal is to be found in Aristotle's treatment of friendship. While Mr. Joad believes that an ethics adequate to present needs must be a derivative discipline, based on psychology and politics, Mr. Field with, I believe, deeper insight, asserts: "If we had not got the specifically moral experience to start from, it would be absolutely impossible to deduce it from anything else. . . . We do not . . . start from a psychological investigation of actual desires or other feelings . . . but from the fact that we make moral judgments," (pp. 131-132). The ideal at which

he at length arrives is not an immediately given fact, like impulse, but it is none the less a reality,—a necessary implication of every moral judgment. It is an ideal situation which if fully known and understood would be the supreme object of desire of every human being; and the animating spirit of the situation would be enlightened love.

Mr. Field's own ethical construction is a pretty application of a principle which he himself advocates. It is the method originally taught by Aristotle in the doctrine of the mean and used with striking effect by Graham Wallas in *Human Nature in Politics*: the quantitative determination of intellectual results. Mr. Field, that is to say, does not ask: Which moral theory is right,—the ancient or the modern? On the contrary, he says: What proportion of ancient theory is vital, and to what extent must it be modified to apply to present conditions?

KATHERINE GILBERT.

PUBLIC SALES

We have purchased 122,000 pairs U. S. Army Munson last shoes, sizes 5½ to 12, which was the entire surplus stock of one of the largest U. S. Government shoe contractors.

This shoe is guaranteed one hundred per cent solid leather, color—dark tan, bellows tongue, dirt and waterproof. The actual value of this shoe is \$6.00. Owing to this tremendous buy we can offer same to the public at \$2.95.

Send correct size. Pay postman on delivery or send money order. If shoes are not as represented we will cheerfully refund your money promptly upon request.

NATIONAL BAY STATE SHOE COMPANY, 296 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N. Y.

The South Atlantic Quarterly

(Established 1902)

Durham, North Carolina

**Cosmopolitan in Scope, Generous
in Policy, but Emphasizing the
Literary Social and Economic Life
of the Southern States**

The Leading Literary Magazine of the South

ISSUED QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

